# REPORT RESUMES

ED 003 126 64

TRAVELING SEMINAR AND CONFERENCE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF EDUCATIONAL INNOVATIONS.

BY- RICHLAND, MALCOLM
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CORP., SANTA MONICA, CALIF.
REPORT NUMBER NDEA-VIIB-357 PUB DATE 25 OCT 65
REPORT NUMBER TM-2691
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.27 HC-$5.76 144P.

DESCRIPTORS- SEMINARS, CONFERENCES, *EDUCATION, *INNOVATION, ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, TEACHERS, INFORMATION DISSEMINATION, *FIELD INSTRUCTION, EXTENSION EDUCATION, EVALUATION, INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION, SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE FIELD EXTENSION SERVICE CONCEPT AS A METHOD FOR DISSEMINATING INFORMATION CONCERNING EDUCATIONAL INNOVATIONS WAS TESTED. A REGIONAL TRAVELING SEMINAR AND CONFERENCE WAS DESIGNED TO ASSESS THE EFFECTS OF FIELD SITE VISITS AND DEMONSTRATIONS OF INNOVATIVE PRACTICES IN OPERATIONAL SCHOOL SITUATIONS UPON PARTICIPATING EDUCATORS. PROCEDURES FOR ITS ACCOMPLISHMENT INCLUDED (1) SELECTION AND ORGANIZATION OF TOUR LEADERS, (2) CHOICE OF SCHOOL SITES TO BE VISITED, (3) SELECTION OF PARTICIPATING EDUCATORS, (4) CONDUCT OF THE SEMINAR AND CONFERENCE, AND (5) FOLLOWUP 1 YEAR LATER IN ORDER TO ASSESS CHANGES IN INNOVATIONAL BEHAVIOR AT THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS PREVIOUSLY VISITED. THE FOLLOWING CONCLUSIONS WERE DRAWN--(1) THE TRAVELING SEMINAR AND CONFERENCE (A FIELD SERVICE CONCEPT) IS A HIGHLY EFFECTIVE DISSEMINATION METHOD FOR STIMULATING AND FACILITATING EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION, (2) THERE ARE MEASURABLE ATTRIBUTES OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS, (3) THE ATTITUDE OF THE LOCAL SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS TOWARD INNOVATION IS AN IMPORTANT VARIABLE IN THE INTRODUCTION OF INNOVATIONS IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS. RECOMMENDATIONS EVOLVING FROM THE PROJECT WERE--(1) THIS TECHNIQUE SHOULD BE EXPANDED AND ACTIVELY SUPPORTED BY ADEQUATE FINANCIAL RESOURCES AS AN EFFECTIVE DISSEMINATION ACTIVITY, (2) THIS TECHNIQUE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED FOR INCORPORATION IN THE DISSEMINATION PROGRAMS OF THE REGIONAL LABORATORIES, (3) SPECIFIC GUIDELINES FOR PLANNING AND ORGANIZING SHOULD BE INCORPORATED, AND (4) SUBSTANTIAL EXPANSION OF PRESENT LIMITED RESEARCH EFFORTS SHOULD BE DEVOTED TO PLANNED CHANGE IN EDUCATION. (HB)

ED003126

TM-2691

# FINAL REPORT

# TRAVELING SEMINAR AND CONFERENCE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF EDUCATIONAL INNOVATIONS

25 October 1965

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

TM-2691

# TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

(TM Series)

**The study reported herein was performed pursuant to Contract No. OE-4-16-007 with the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under the provisions of Title VII of the National Defense Education Act.**

# FINAL REPORT

# TRAVELING SEMINAR AND CONFERENCE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF EDUCATIONAL INNOVATIONS

by

Malcolm Richland

25 October 1965

SYSTEM
DEVELOPMENT
CORPORATION
2500 COLORADO AVE.
SANTA MONICA
CALIFORNIA

**The views, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this document do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of agencies of the United States Government.**

**Excepting agencies of the United States Government, permission to quote from this document or to reproduce it, wholly or in part, should be obtained in advance from the System Development Corporation.**

# ABSTRACT

The existing lag between the reporting of sound, well-tested innovational practices and their widespread implementation in the educational programs of public schools is a long-standing problem of major proportions. This project report describes an approach designed to reduce the time lag between the development of new classroom practices and diffusion of proven ideas throughout the Nation's school districts. Under the provisions of the National Defense Education Act, Title VII, Part B, System Development Corporation was awarded a contract by the U. S. Office of Education to conduct a study of the effectiveness of "traveling seminars," or field site visits, by educators to schools that were known to be operating successful innovation programs. The purpose of the project was to see whether this technique was an effective dissemination method for shortening the gap between innovation and practice in education. This report presents a summary of the project and includes the conclusions and recommendations of the SDC study.

The principal objectives of the SDC project were to: (1) Conduct a survey of, and visitations to, school sites with outstanding innovations; (2) Implement and conduct a traveling seminar of some 120 educators to selected innovating school districts in four regions of the United States; (3) Conduct a conference on the problems of implementing tested innovations; and (4) Perform research related to the testing of the field extension concept in education.

SDC study results presented in this report include the following: (1) The traveling seminar and follow-up conference concept is a highly effective dissemination method for stimulating and facilitating educational innovation; (2) There are measurable attributes of school districts related to the innovational behavior of these districts; and (3) The attitude of the local superintendent of schools toward innovation is a significant variable in the introduction of innovations in school districts.

Based on the results of the project the following recommendations are offered. (1) The traveling seminar technique should be expanded and actively supported as an effective dissemination activity by the USOE, state departments of education, and local school districts. (2) The traveling seminar and conference method of disseminating information about educational innovations should be considered for incorporation in the dissemination programs of the planned USOE regional laboratories for research and development under Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. (3) Future traveling seminars should be modified in organization to include the suggestions for improvement that are included in the report. (4) Substantial expansion of present limited research efforts should be devoted to planned change in education. A number of recommended areas of inquiry are offered for consideration.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK NOT FILMED
PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1

FOREWORD . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 5

PART I - DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 11

- A. Background . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 11
- B. SDC Study Objectives . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 15
- C. Review of Procedures . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 17
- D. Data Collection . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 23

PART II - TRAVELING SEMINAR AND CONFERENCE . . . . . . . . . . . . 25

- A. Introduction . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 25
- B. Traveling Seminar and Conference Objectives . . . . . . . 26
- C. School Visitation Sites . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 27
- D. Traveling Seminar Tour Reports . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 30
- E. Selected Conference Addresses . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 37
- F. Institutional Area Work Group Reports . . . . . . . . . . 43
- G. Seminar Sessions . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 45
- H. Final Tour Group Meeting Summary . . . . . . . . . . . . . 45
- I. Summary and Conclusions . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 47

PART III - EVALUATION OF FIELD SERVICE CONCEPT IN EDUCATION . . . 53

- A. Introduction . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 53
- B. Informal Evaluation . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 54
- C. Formal Evaluation . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 68

PART IV - SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 81

- A. Introduction . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 81
- B. Conclusions . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 81
- C. Recommendations . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 85

Page

APPENDICES . . . 91

Appendix A - Program: A Conference on the Implementation of Educational Innovations . . . . . . 93

Appendix B - Traveling Seminar Tour Itineraries . . . . . . . 99

Appendix C - Data Collection Instruments . . . . . . . . . 111

Appendix D - Follow-Up Activities: Examples . . . . . . . . 127

# FOREWORD

Rapid technological progress has highlighted changing educational requirements in a dynamic society and focused public attention upon the strategic importance of education to the Nation's well-being. National aspirations in defense and space, aid to developing nations, and commitment to more rapid economic progress have created unprecedented pressures for more and better trained scientific and technical manpower and increased educational productivity in school programs.

On the domestic scene, our educational system is characterized by continuing growth in the number of people to be educated at all levels and by demands for increased efficiency and improved quality in the educational product. These requirements exist within the framework of an inadequate supply of teachers and school facilities. The supply and demand problem is further complicated by the fact that curriculum content in education must be substantially altered and increased beyond what has been necessary in the past. Revolutionary progress in science and technology has resulted in requirements for changes in the amount and nature of the subject matter which must be transmitted to youth in schools and colleges. In practically every discipline, but particularly in the sciences, new knowledge is being generated at an exponential rate. As our society becomes more complex, with increasing intercommunication, urbanization, and industrialization, and as the body of available knowledge in all fields continues to expand, the task of education will become immeasurably greater. Schools will be forced to assume a new importance in both domestic and international affairs. These requirements have important implications for the number and kinds of teachers, school facilities, and the efficiency of the entire educational process itself.

The need for major educational reform in the Nation's schools to meet these increased national requirements is widely accepted. President Johnson, in his January 12, 1965 Message to the Congress relative to the need for new educational legislation expressed this point of view when he said:

> We are now embarked on another venture to put the American dream to work in meeting the new demands of a new day. Once again we must start where men who would improve their society have always known they must begin--with an educational system restudied, reinforced, and revitalized.

In meeting the challenge of technological change, solutions patterned after traditional teacher-pupil ratios and school organization show little promise. The resources required are not only expensive, but slow in becoming available in the needed numbers. The real task involves a major overhaul and redesign of the Nation's educational system. Many of the organizational concepts and instructional techniques now employed in schools will need to be replaced by new ones designed to increase efficiency and improve quality. In its 1964 Annual Report, the Carnegie Corporation clearly stated the case for educational change:

> Education in the United States today requires innovation on every front. The old methods, the old facilities, and the old modes of organization are no longer adequate. They must be replaced by new ones that will meet not only today's but tomorrow's problems, taking from their predecessors the good that can be carried forward and integrating it with the new. Ideally, provisions for continuous innovation should be built into the educational system.

Francis Keppel, U. S. Commissioner of Education, in his July 16, 1965 address at the American Management Association Conference on "The Impact of Educational Technology," also stressed the need for major changes in the content, methods, and process of American education when he said:

> The demands on education today are huge. And they grow increasingly urgent. The pressures of our revolutionary age call upon education as never before in this Nation's history to give meaning, stability and continuity to our era.
>
> We ask for equality of educational opportunity for all our children, whoever they are, wherever they live. And we want greatly improved quality throughout our educational structure.
>
> We ask for education of a caliber capable of serving our expanding and migrating population. And we want an educational system in harmony with our modern dynamic and changing economy.
>
> We ask for education that will catch up and keep up with the exploding knowledge about the universe. And we want an education for the leaders and the learners, the men of affairs and the men of scholarship who will determine the strength and stature of our Nation in the years ahead.
>
> But with all these requirements, the colossus of education, instead of being responsive to change, for decades has resisted it. Now we are imperatively challenged to get American education in motion, into a continuing pattern of response to developing needs.
>
> This year we have made a powerful beginning to move the collossus. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is, at one and the same time, the most imaginative single measure ever passed for the Nation's schools and the boldest array of specifics to reshape them and reform them.
>
> If education is to move from its old moorings, however, it will need more than the administration of funds, however sizeable. It must find new departures, new approaches and new, bold ways of applying them within our schools.

Although the need for change in educational practice has been widely accepted and documented by the President, well-known educators, legislators, and community leaders, the means for effecting such change have not been readily available. The last decade has brought an abundance of new concepts through research and experimentation, yet these ideas have not produced educational innovations on a nation-wide scale. The problem continues to be one of translating these new ideas, techniques, and novel approaches to changed practice into forms that are usable in schools, testing their use in real settings, and diffusing the proven ideas throughout the Nation's educational system.

In March 1964, under the provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, Title VII, Part B, System Development Corporation was awarded a contract by the U. S. Office of Education to test the effectiveness of the Department of Agriculture's "field extension service concept" for possible application in education.

The study was specifically designed to evaluate the use of field site visits by touring educators to schools that were known to be operating well-tested and successful innovation programs. The purpose was to see whether this dissemination technique was an effective method for shortening the gap between innovation and practice in education, and for expediting generally the process of educational improvement.

This document, TM-2691 is the final report of the SDC study. Part I provides an overall description of the project, study objectives, a review of general procedures, and data collection techniques that were employed in conducting the study. Part II includes detailed descriptions and reports of four regional traveling seminar group visits to innovating school districts, and a summary and report of results of the SDC-sponsored conference that followed the tour experience. Part III presents formal and informal evaluative data related to the empirical testing of the traveling seminar-conference technique as a field extension service concept. A summary of the project, conclusions, and recommendations are provided in Part IV of the report. The

Appendices include samples of the SDC traveling seminar program and the four regional tour itineraries, copies of SDC data collection instruments, and samples of programs used in follow-up activities by tour participants during the time period following the SDC conference.

Wade Robinson contributed significantly in planning the project and selection of the regional tour leaders and participants. Much of the success of the project was due to the tireless efforts of the tour leaders: Richard Dershimer, Hollis Moore, Ralph D. Purdy, and C. Taylor Whittier. Appreciation is also extended to the SDC Education and Training Staff of the Research and Technology Directorate for their assistance in planning and supervising the formal evaluation phase of the project. Special acknowledgment is due M. Stephen Sheldon for his efforts in data collection and preparation of the research report section of the final report. John F. O'Toole, Jr., SDC Manager of Education Projects, read the entire manuscript and contributed significantly to content, style, and organization of the report.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

# PART I

# DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

## A. BACKGROUND

Innovation implies change, the introduction of something new. Every year industry redesigns established products or presents new ones. In medicine the estimated time lag between research and practice is two years. Conversely, educators have been notoriously slow in introducing innovations and accepting new ideas. In the 1930s Paul Mort reported that when an educational innovation had been introduced to meet a pervasive need, approximately fifteen years elapsed before even three percent of the Nation's school systems had installed the change.[1] Adoption rates of innovations increased rapidly after a ten percent point was reached, but complete diffusion in schools appeared to take as much as fifty years. Kindergartens, for example, were proved to be a valid educational idea more than seventy years ago. Yet today, only one-half of our public school districts offer kindergarten programs.

However, there are currently some encouraging signs of enthusiastic interest in educational innovation. Just fifteen months after the launching of Sputnik I on October 4, 1957, the rate of instructional change in the public schools of New York State alone had more than doubled. Today, new ideas of all kinds are being advocated, evaluated, and installed in a number of the Nation's schools.

---

[1] Mort, P. R. and Cornell, F. G. American Schools in Transition. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1941.

Experimentation is underway to determine how education can best be divided among large-group instruction, individual study, and small-group discussion. Programs which make better use of time, professional talent, physical facilities, and other resources are beginning to show promising results. Educational television, team teaching, ungraded classes, language laboratories, teaching machines and other innovations are gradually finding their way into schools and colleges.

This impetus for change has come from widespread public concern about the need for increased educational quality and productivity in the space age, and has found expression in various interest groups mobilizing for educational reform. Evidence of this interest is a statement from the foreword of the book edited by Matthew B. Miles:[2]

> A generation ago, only three groups of people were actively involved in educational innovation: The curriculum-makers, the school administrators, and certain social theorists. What a contrast with the situation now! These people are still involved, but they have been joined by new, potent groups: Scientists and other scholars, missing since early this century; foundation executives; journalists; government officials and ad hoc groups of interested and concerned citizens.

Despite this new interest and evidence of efforts toward educational innovation, significant changes in school practice have occurred in only a small percentage of the Nation's 30,000 school districts. There is still a large gap between research findings and widespread diffusion of tested innovations in the majority of schools. Francis Ianni, Director of the

---

[2] Miles, M. B. Innovation in Education. New York: Bureau ofPublications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Division of Educational Research, U. S. Office of Education recently stated that:

> The last ten years of research have not brought about the far-reaching changes in practice that were hoped for because neither the efforts to innovate nor the arrangements for diffusing innovation have been developed on a scale that even approaches the need.[3]

At present a number of strategies are being used to introduce innovation in schools. However, the results have not been entirely satisfactory since much of the current focus is on the content of change, rather than consideration of the change itself. A number of questions remain to be answered: Why do some educators resist change? Why does a particular innovation take hold immediately? What would stimulate school officials to try certain tested innovations in methods of instruction and the use of new educational media? What are the identifiable factors that mitigate toward change? How can the results of research be made more readily available to practitioners? Are there examples in other disciplines--in the fields of medicine, the military sciences or agriculture--that could serve as useful models for organizing and speeding the process of change in educational practice? Could a field extension service concept, similar to that employed by the U. S. Department of Agriculture, be the answer to some of the above questions?

A brief explanation of the field extension service concept of the Department of Agriculture is necessary since it is pertinent to the study that is described in this report. Dr. David Clark, in Phi Delta Kappa's Third Symposium on Educational Research (Bloomington, Indiana, 1962) summarized the concept when he stated:

---

[3] Ianni, F. A. J. "research and Experimentation in Education." Phi Delta Kappan, June 1965, p. 489.

> Education today may have roughly the same relationship to its practitioners that existed in the field of agriculture in the latter part of the nineteenth century. At that time, the primary vehicle of communication to the practitioner was the printed word--from research to practitioner. The impact on agricultural practice was slight. Interposed now between the researcher and the practitioner are two levels of translation. The extension specialist can read the research and translate it into something the county agent can understand. The county agent, however, does not typically pass this information directly on to the practitioner. Instead, he provides an opportunity for the farmer to visit another farm in his neighborhood where the new practice is being employed (the research has already been packaged for marketing). The situation is a real one. The farmer using the new method is risking his own money on his own farm. The visiting farmer has a chance to see what is going on and talk to the experimental farmer about it. The same suspicion on the part of the practitioner in regard to new practices, noted as typical of the teacher, led the Department of Agriculture to adopt this technique.

Although much can be learned from this type of demonstration program in the field of agriculture, it becomes increasingly clear that in education a somewhat different program is needed. Demonstrations in education have been ineffectual as a stimulant for adoption of new practices primarily because the typical demonstration has not been carried on in a credible situation. Most demonstration has been performed in a university environment or in a demonstration center which lacks the operational limitations associated with the typical public school situation. The aforementioned lack has made it easy to rationalize away any transfer value to actual public school settings, and in many instances, the rationalization was based on sound observation.

Recognizing the need for credibility, the Field Extension Service of the Agriculture Department uses local farms and farmers in their demonstration programs. A locally based field agent arranges the demonstrations, provides assistance in implementation and coordinates the activities. Research reported both by Lionberger[4] and by Gallaher[5] indicate that in the early innovative stages, the outside change agent is very important. In later stages this importance diminishes and the impact of the local adopter becomes pivotal. Medicine reports similar findings, especially in the adoption of new drugs. Mort,[6] Lippett,[7] and Miles[8] each in separate research, support the above and have reported that the early adopters in a particular field, in relation to an innovation, draw a goodly amount of their information from outside change agents.

## B. SDC STUDY OBJECTIVES

In March 1964, under the provisions of Public Law 85-864, Title VII, Part B, of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, System Development Corporation was awarded an eighteen-month contract by the U. S. Office of

---

[4] Lionberger, H. F. "The Diffusion Research Tradition in Rural Sociology and Its Relation to Implemented Change in Public School Systems." This paper was read at the Symposium on Identifying Techniques and Principles for Gaining Acceptance of Research Results of Use of Newer Media in Education, Lincoln, Nebraska, November 1963.

[5] Gallaher, A., Jr. "The Role of the Advocate and Directed Change." This paper was read at the Symposium on Identifying Techniques and Principles for Gaining Acceptance of Research Results of Use of New Media in Education, Lincoln, Nebraska, November 1963.

[6] Mort, Ibid.

[7] Lippett, R. Training in Community Relations. New York: Harper, 1949.

[8] Miles, op. cit., Chapter 19.

Education, Educational Media Branch, to test the effectiveness of the agricultural field extension service concept in education. The SDC study was specifically designed to assess the use of school visitations and "outside change agents" as a means for extending applications of innovations in education. The project had four major objectives, as follows:

1. To conduct a survey of, and visitations to, school sites with outstanding innovations;

2. To implement and conduct a traveling seminar of some 120 educators to selected innovating school districts in four regions of the United States;

3. To conduct a conference on the problems of implementing tested innovations;

4. To perform research related to the testing of the field extension service concept in education.

Principal activities of the project included a traveling seminar in which four groups of approximately 30 educators each, representing four regions of the United States, visited selected schools where significant innovations had been introduced and in operation for at least one year. Immediately following the seminar, a conference of tour participants was conducted at SDC on the dynamics of educational change; approximately one year later, on-site visitations to the participants' own schools were implemented.

The school visitation sites were analogous to the demonstration centers inherent in the field extension concept of the Department of Agriculture. Each tour was led by a well-known and respected educator ("outside change agent"), who was accepted by his professional colleagues as being especially qualified to interpret the experimental foundations upon which a particular innovation was based, if such foundations were, in fact, offered by the innovator.

The conference provided an opportunity to report on the school visitations, to evaluate the demonstrations and innovations, and to discuss in depth the dynamics of educational change. The interim report of this SDC project, Proceedings of the Conference on the Implementation of Educational Innovations, SDC document, TM(L)-2105, provides a complete report of the conference.

The evaluative study, completed approximately one year later, sought to assess the behavioral efforts of the traveling seminar and conference upon the participants through comparison before and after the school visitation experience. The analysis was accomplished by collecting data on innovational behavior and attitudes toward innovation from both the tour participants and an equal number of control school personnel who did not visit innovational schools.

## C. REVIEW OF PROCEDURES

This project was designed to be an empirical test of the applicability of the field extension service concept to the problem of implementing innovations in education. The study was divided into phases of effort corresponding to the principal study objectives, as stated earlier in this chapter. The sequence of events included the selection and organization of tour leaders; choice of school sites to be visited during the seminar; selection of participating educators in the traveling seminar and conference; conduct of the seminar and conference; and finally, follow-up visits approximately one year later in order to assess changes in innovational behavior as evidenced in the participants' own school districts.

Detailed descriptions of the traveling seminar and conference, as well as data collected from the follow-up visits to schools are presented in subsequent chapters of this report and will not be reported here. However, certain selection procedures and criteria were employed, and data collection instruments were developed for use during the project. A short explanation of these procedures and instruments follows.

1. Tour Leaders

The traveling seminars were dependent, for successful completion, upon the abilities and techniques of the tour leaders. It was therefore essential to recruit effective tour leaders who could cope with complex group dynamics while providing strong leadership. A list of potential tour leaders was prepared from a survey of the literature, names suggested by educational leaders, and suggestions by the SDC project staff. Dr. Wade Robinson, the prime consultant to this project, was extremely helpful in suggesting names and in making selections. The following tour leaders accepted leadership responsibility for conduct of visitation tours to school sites:

a. West: Dr. Hollis Moore, then Dean of the College of Education at the University of Arizona, and now Director of Educational Projects, W. K. Kellog Foundation.

b. Midwest: Dr. Ralph Purdy, Director, Bureau of Educational Field Services, and Professor of Education, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.

c. South: Dr. C. Taylor Whittier, then Superintendent of Schools, Montgomery County Schools, Maryland, and presently Superintendent of the Philadelphia Public Schools

d. East: Dr. Richard Dershimer, then Director of Special Products, Pennsylvania Office of Public Instruction, and now Executive Secretary of the American Educational Research Association.

Following acceptance of tour leadership responsibilities, a meeting was convened with the regional tour leaders and procedures for selection of visitation sites and conduct of the tours were defined and agreed upon.

## 2. School Visitation Sites

The criteria used for selection of school visitation sites were based on evidence of successful implementation of instructional innovations. These included programs that focused upon teachers' use of new educational media, major changes in curriculum, innovative teaching methods, and new school organizational patterns involving the use of teachers' time and classroom space. Additionally, school districts of different sizes, representing a cross section, were selected in each region. The final criterion specified that each visitation site selected was to have had at least one year's experience with a new educational program. Token innovations not integrated into the total ongoing instructional program were not considered.

A preliminary list of school visitation sites was established by a search of the literature, recommendations by nationally known educators, a polling of officials from several state departments of education, and from polling of a sample of personnel in teacher training institutions in various parts of the country. After the preliminary list was established, these school districts were screened by examination of written and published reports about the district. The screening resulted in a selection of six sites in each of the four regions. All of these sites were then visited by the tour leaders. The tour leader then selected a minimum of three sites to be visited by participants in the traveling seminar.

All arrangements for school visitations were made by the tour leaders. These arrangements included briefings of local school officials in preparation for the tour, a seminar session with school district personnel following the tour, and procurement of a firm commitment from the local district to provide a credible demonstration. The sites visited and the specific educational innovations observed are listed and discussed in Part II of this report, "Traveling Seminar and Conference."

3. Tour Participants

The evidence from Brickell's study for the New York State Department of Education and the preliminary reports of the Western States Small School Project seem to indicate that the school administrator is the primary agent for change in schools where innovations have been implemented.[9] Therefore it seemed appropriate that each tour group include a number of school administrators.

In order to provide a concentration of effort toward innovation, personnel from state departments of education and several representatives from teacher-training institutions were included as participants on the tour. The final composition of each tour group included fifteen administrators, eight state education department officials, and seven representatives of teacher-training institutions. It should be noted that school districts only are considered in this report in terms of the measurement of change in innovational behavior. Evaluation was not made of the state departments of education, the teacher-training institutions or their representatives. Possible innovational change behavior of these groups was beyond the scope of this study.

---

[9] Brickell, H. M. Organizing New York State for Educational Change. Albany, New York: State Education Department, 1961.

4. Control School Districts

Leading educational authorities, representatives of several state departments of education, and teacher-training institutions were asked to submit lists of school districts that meet the following criteria:

a. Demonstrated interest in innovation

b. Increased student enrollments, teacher shortages, lack of funds, or overcrowding

c. Community population consisting of more than ten thousand, but not more than three hundred thousand.

A list of three hundred school districts was assembled. For the sake of economy, one limitation was placed on random selection for participation in the traveling seminar and conference: States on the list having the largest representation of districts were selected. The resulting tour groups were composed of school districts from the following states:

a. East - New York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts
b. Midwest - Ohio, Michigan, and Illinois
c. West - California, Arizona, and Oregon
d. South - Maryland and Florida (both representing county organization)

Participants were then randomly selected. Those selected who were unable to accept were designated control school districts, and the remaining controls were selected randomly from the same basic list.

## D. DATA COLLECTION

The data gathered during this project were derived from several questionnaire instruments, structured interview guides, and reports prepared by participants and tour leaders in the four seminar groups. The questionnaires and interview guides were prepared and administered by SDC project staff members to participating school district personnel at specified times during the conduct of the project. The instruments used for data collection include the following:

### 1. Innovation Questionnaire (Form A)

Each participating and control school district superintendent was requested to complete a questionnaire concerning the status of selected innovations in his own district. A sample of this questionnaire appears in Appendix C. The questionnaire was administered in 1964, prior to participation in the traveling seminar, and again during the spring semester of 1965, approximately one year later.

### 2. Structured Interview Guide (Form B)

Trained SDC project staff interviewers visited approximately one-half of the participant and control districts to sample the opinions of the superintendents concerning the origins and forces contributing to the support or deterrence of educational innovation in his own school district. A sample of the structured interview guide appears in Appendix C.

3. Structured Interview Guide (Form C)

All school districts in this project, both participant and control, were visited by a trained SDC interviewer and data were collected in demographic, fiscal, and personnel categories of information. A sample of the structured interview guide appears in Appendix C of this report.

4. Reports

The formal report of each tour group presented at the SDC conference and reports from conference recorders provide the balance of data that are presented in subsequent sections of this document. A summary of the results of the conference are presented in the succeeding chapter, Part II, "Traveling Seminar and Conference." The research data pertaining to the field extension service concept in education were collected by questionnaire and personal interview. The results of this phase of the project are reported in Part III of this report, "Evaluation of the Field Extension Service Concept in Education."

# PART II

## TRAVELING SEMINAR AND CONFERENCE

### A. INTRODUCTION

The traveling seminar phase of this project divided approximately 120 educators into four regional tour groups and was conducted during the period from May 11-15, 1964. Each of the groups included fifteen administrators, eight senior representatives of state departments of education, and seven professors from teacher training institutions. The tour groups visisted school districts in the East, Midwest, South, and West to observe and study innovations in the use of new media, school program organization, curriculum, and instructional methodology. The tours were led by a tour leader who was a nationally recognized educator, assisted by a representative from the SDC project staff. All of the regional tours were conducted simultaneously.

Immediately following the tours, the four groups assembled at the SDC facility in Santa Monica, California and a conference was conducted during May 16-19, 1964. At this conference, the traveling seminar participants were joined by the key innovators from the schools that were visited, a selected group of consultants, and specialists from SDC.

The conference provided closure for the traveling seminars by (1) enabling the four groups to exchange and compare their experiences, and (2) enabling all participants to analyze and evaluate the innovations they had observed in the use of educational media, methods, and materials. In addition, the conference focused considerable attention upon the change process and the variables associated with implementing innovations in operational school settings.

A detailed report of the conference proceedings is provided in SDC document TM(L)-2105, Interim Report: Proceedings of the Conference on the Implementation of Educational Innovations, October 5, 1964. This section of the final report will, therefore, not repeat the comprehensive material contained in the earlier report. Rather, succeeding pages provide a summary of the most significant aspects of the traveling seminar and conference phases of the project. For more detailed information, attention is invited to the earlier report.

## B. TRAVELING SEMINAR AND CONFERENCE OBJECTIVES

The specific objectives of the traveling seminar and conference were:

1. To determine the value of an educational field service, the function of which would be to disseminate information, make resource people available, and stimulate the implementation of tested and/or potentially valuable innovations;

2. To provide the tour participants with an opportunity to discuss extensively specific innovations with key persons from sites visited and with selected leaders concerned with the specific innovations;

3. To explore the dynamics of change as they apply to the implementation of innovations at all levels of education;

4. To define problems in, and obstacles to, the introduction and implementation of educational innovations;

5. To describe and assess existing resources for implementing desirable educational innovations;

6. To clarify the role in innovations of each of the institutions represented, i.e., the teacher-training institution, the state department of education, and the local district;

7. To make specific recommendations for a systematic approach to the implementation of educational innovation; and

8. To outline basic research questions that relate to the processes of innovation.

C. SCHOOL VISITATION SITES

The traveling seminar was, in fact, four separate groups that participated simultaneously in the visitation and seminar activity. The groups met individually on Monday, May 11, 1964. Each group was briefed by the tour leader and remained together for the remainder of the week to visit the selected school districts. A complete itinerary of each tour is included in Appendix B. The visitation sites selected and the innovations observed follow:

1. Southern Tour

   a. Districts Visited

      Melbourne School District, Melbourne, Florida

Broward County Public Schools, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida
McIntosh Student Center, Middle School, Sarasota, Florida

b. Innovations Observed

Team Teaching
Continuous Progress Plan
New School Design
Ungraded High School
Data Processing Center (on-site computer)
Language Laboratories
Closed Circuit Educational Television

2. Eastern Tour

a. Districts Visisted

Newton Public Schools, Newton, Massachusetts
Manhasset Public Schools, Long Island, New York
Plainview Public Schools, Long Island, New York

b. Innovations Observed

Continuous Progress Plan
Lay Personnel on Teaching Staff
New Vocational Training Plan for Culturally Disadvantaged Students
Educational Media Center
Closed Circuit Educational Television
New Curriculum Materials
Auto-Instructional Devices for Individual Study
Flexible Scheduling

3. Midwestern Tour

a. Districts Visited

Flint Community Schools, Flint, Michigan
Harper Creek Community Schools, Battle Creek, Michigan
Evanston High School District, Evanston, Illinois
Livonia Public Schools, Livonia, Michigan
Pontiac Public Schools, Pontiac, Michigan
University High School, Chicago, Illinois

b. Innovations Observed

Team Teaching
Programed Instruction
School-Community Concept

Rural Consolidation Program
Ungraded English Courses
Social Studies (great issues plan)
Educational Media Center
Individualized Instruction (study carrels)
Non-Graded School (grades 1-3; 4-6)
Flexible Scheduling
Unified Science Program

4. Western Tour

a. Districts Visited

Tucson Public Schools, Tucson, Arizona
East Side Union High School District, San Jose, California
Fremont Union High School District, Sunnyvale, California

b. Innovations Observed

Team Teaching
Cooperative Research Program (university)
Programed Instruction
Contract Plan
Language Laboratories
Flexible Space School Design
Flexible Scheduling
Special Counseling Team Guidance for Culturally Deprived Children

The tours were designed to serve two purposes. First, they were intended to stimulate participating school administrators to adopt or expand their application of certain tested innovations in new media and instructional methodology. The second purpose was designed to test the field extension service concept as it might apply to public education. It was hypothesized that educators visiting school sites very much like their own, under the guidance of a field service "agent" who could interpret research findings in terms that were meaningful to the practitioner, would tend to adopt or expand the application of new practices wherever they might be appropriate to a local need. By obtaining information on innovational behavior and attitudes toward innovation from both the tour participants and an equal number of control schools, the SDC project staff gathered data upon which to assess the behavioral effects of the traveling seminar through comparison of observations before, and one year after, the tour experience. The data pertaining to the evaluation of the field extension service concept are presented in the next chapter of this report, Part III.

## D. TRAVELING SEMINAR TOUR REPORTS

A report from each of the four regional tours was prepared by the respective tour leaders and presented during the SDC conference at Santa Monica during May 16-19, 1964. As reflected in the following pages, the conference was designed to encourage discussion among the participants, grouped according to institutional membership, state or regional membership, and functional interest areas, e.g., team teaching, curriculum, school organization, and related substantive categories.

In order to retain the flavor and informality of these discussions, transcripts were made of the general sessions and seminar discussions. Each transcript was edited and, in all but one instance, reviewed and approved by the actual participants prior to publication. It should be emphasized that the proceedings are not formally prepared statements by the participants, but remarks set forth in an informal style appropriate to the discussion as it occurred

1. West (Hollis Moore)

Hollis Moore reviewed briefly the innovations that the Western tour group had seen and summarized the tour by quoting one of the westerners who said that they had seen "artifacts in advance." This, Moore stated, was not really the essence of what was happening, but rather, represented the instructional tools, the administrative arrangements, and the procedures that have been developed by schools. These things reflected the attempt by educators to be more responsive to individual needs and requirements of today's school population. Educators hope that these creations or innovations will result in three major accomplishments: (1) that schools will breathe some life into the experience that the children are getting; (2) that teachers and principals can be released from traditional restrictions and limitations; and (3) that a general loosening up of space, pace and time will result. Commenting on the visitations, Moore observed that many participants spent, for the first time in years, an uninterrupted hour in the back of the classroom, watching the teacher and a roomful of students in action.

Reporting on the westerners' reactions to what they had seen and the discussions in which they had engaged, Moore listed some of their common questions, which reinforced Clark's observation that what is needed is systematic, sophisticated research on the change process.

Where does the incentive for change reside? Moore told the conferees that among the underlying incentives present in different situations were: response to pressures; desire for attention; institutional ego satisfaction; notoriety; crisis situations (serious increase in dropouts, over-crowding, sudden racial imbalance); outside influences (universities, foundations, government); and dissatisfaction with current practice (present in almost every situation, often resulting in discomfort with the inconsistencies in education between what we know and what we do).

What circumstances are common in innovative schools? The response of the group to this question, Moore continued, was less dogmatic. They observed that the schools they visited were either new schools or in a period of rapid growth. In almost every instance, they saw evidence of positive leadership from a forceful administrator. Some outside influences were usually found, such as consultants; a university nearby with a program that it was pushing; foundation support; and competition, intra-district or inter-district, implying that the desire to be better was stronger than the desire to be good. Most innovative schools also have capable staffs, perhaps assembled for a new school, or selected for special purposes or sometimes deliberately to depart from custom and tradition, or assembled in participation with a nearby university in an intern system.

Other questions were raised: Are there common steps that need to be taken in the change process? Are changes truly processes or are they really discrete events? At what level are most of the important decisions made that affect the outcome of efforts to innovate?

Moore concluded his report by posing two new "Parkinson's laws" that might be tested by the attendees. The first is the law of "Frustration Reduction." In Parkinson-like terms this states that "educational changes occur because teachers will work on any new plan which promises to reduce their frustrations," frustrations caused by facilities too unbending, groups of students too diverse in their abilities, media too old-fashioned, etc. The second one is the law of "Innovative Regression" which states that "when the rosy glow of initial introduction of an idea fades, a faculty will regress to previous practices, unless the innovation results in better conditions at work for the faculty."

Moore concluded with this thought. "Bureaucratic institutions have a tendency always to revert toward a steady state, to maintain equilibrium rather than change. Change, then, occurs when equilibrium is disturbed."

2. Midwest (Ralph Purdy)

Ralph Purdy reported on the Midwestern group's experience and began by giving their definition of innovation in education--"The creative selection, organization, and utilization of human material resources in new and unique ways which result in the attainment of a higher level of achievement for the defined goals and objectives. It is innovation, if, within this framework, the outcome is unique, distinctive from the status quo, and is readily identifiable. It is significantly innovational when the concept, the idea, the process, the media, or the tool through which the innovation is given expression has meaning to others, is accepted and approved by them, and the process for a more general implementation becomes operative." With this as a guideline, the group embarked on their visitations.

The group, Purdy observed, became increasingly concerned with the process of innovation rather than with any particular innovation itself. "The process of innovation," he said, "appears to be as varied and diverse as the number of people involved," although one element appeared to be common in most cases--innovation had its inception in the mind of one person or a limited group of persons. Development from that point had many patterns. The key factor in the development of innovations--the timing, extent, and degree of involvement of others--is dependent upon the "artistry of administrative leadership."

Purdy summarized the observations of the four different committees that comprised the Midwestern group. The factors they identified as contributing to or facilitating the implementation of innovations were the following:

a. a philosophy of education that stimulates and encourages change and innovation;

b. an organization, a structure, a system that facilitates change;

c. leadership, wherever it may occur, but particularly at the higher levels of the administrative organization (the superintendent, the principal), dedicated to study and to planning for growth and improvement;

d. expectations for quality education by the individual staff member, the staff as a whole, the administration, the board of education, and the community;

e. situational factors (a setting, an atmosphere, personal relationships, mutual respect among staff members, etc.) that tend to promote a sense of internal security on the part of individual staff members, the staff as a composite group, the administration, the board of education, and the community;

f. motivational factors as exemplified by risk or seed money, the crisis aspect that requires or brings about change, a felt need for change, dynamic leadership (whether permissive, encouraging, stimulating, guiding, promoting, or supporting);

g. continuous and creative evaluation (generally informal).

The factors that appeared to hinder or limit innovations were as follows:

a. lack of a clear definition of innovation;

b. absence of general research in relation to the innovation;

c. absence of research in the designing and implementation of the program for the innovational concept;

d. lack of evaluation pertaining to the innovation (although it was apparent that there was much informal evaluation of a continuous nature);

e. failure to establish priorities in the development of the innovating proposal or plan;

f. staff resistance;

g. failure to communicate effectively;

h. limitations owing to a lack of risk money;

i. legal obstructions;

j. excessive demands on the time and energy of a leader.

Purdy then commented on the responsibility for innovation. He agreed in substance with the observation of Brickell that the key figure is the superintendent. Purdy added, however, that leadership may emanate from the principal, the teacher, or an individual in the community. But, wherever the leadership comes from, there must be a "willingness to push forward in spite of legal restrictions; an urge to improve; a good understanding of the total process and involvements in order to effect the appropriate correlation of all the various areas, and to make decisions to bring about the improvement."

Purdy then listed some recommendations for related studies:

a. The traveling seminar concept should be tried at the state level.

b. The traveling seminar should become an ongoing activity regionally.

c. Traveling seminars should be organized to study and explore some of the following pressing problems in education today:

    1) school district organization;

    2) integration--reasons for success or failure;

    3) data processing (administrative and educational);

    4) innovational practices in school administration;

    5) the change process as it related to education;

    6) the problems of the administrator in a large city.

Purdy summarized the reactions of the participants: "Seminar members especially liked the opportunity to be participants; the understanding, knowledge, and insights gained from the visits; the stimulation and challenge received from observations; the opportunity to spend a professional week together with representatives from local school administration, state departments, and colleges and universities;

and the geographic spread of participants." The seminar members "were unanimous in their support and approval for touring seminars... devoted to significant and compelling problems of education and of our culture." In conclusion, "Although the tour occurred at one of the busiest times of the school year, all members felt that the tour had been exceedingly valuable to them, both personally and professionally."

3. South (James Sensenbaugh--reporting for C. Taylor Whittier)

James A. Sensenbaugh reported on the Southern tour for C. Taylor Whittier, tour leader. This group, as well as the Midwesterners, seemed to be more interested in the conditions that effect change than in specific innovations. Six small discussion groups met often throughout the tour and evaluated the influences that certain factors, identified at their first meeting, might have in bringing about change. This provided the framework for their visitations and seminar sessions.

The innovations that they observed, continued Sensenbaugh, seemed to be a response to the need for more flexibility, which in turn would allow for greater attention to individual needs. The examples he cited were: (1) continuous growth programs substituted for grade level standards; (2) the encouragement of independent study and research by highly motivated or gifted pupils; (3) development and implementation of new and broader instructional materials and programs; (4) greater use of technology; and (5) new buildings that allowed more flexibility for the new organizational patterns such as team teaching, large and small group instruction, and flexible schedules.

Sensenbaugh observed that when innovations were present, there was an apparent decrease in disciplinary problems, an increase in the esprit de corps of the pupils, a greater effort to learn, a wider acceptance of responsibilities by the pupils, and a greater effort put forth by the teaching staff. Certainly, some of this must be attributed to the "Hawthorne" effect, he warned.

Where innovations existed, he continued, they were usually preceded by changes in the community's socio-economic status, power structure, or population.

Innovations frequently followed dissatisfaction, either from within or outside the profession, and resulted in visitations by some staff members to other systems, consultation with recognized authorities, an opening of lines of communication, and support from the board of education, which encouraged the staff to try new ides.

Sensenbaugh stated that innovations flourished when the community had confidence in a strong leader who had a competitive spirit, vision, commitment, and courage to improve the educational opportunity for children.

In his concluding remarks, Sensenbaugh pointed to some of the agencies and pressure groups, outside the school, that have had a major influence in effecting change. He made special reference to foundation grants, national curriculum committees, federal aid and support, professional societies, professional educational organizations, and consultants.

### 4. East (Richard Dershimer)

Reporting for the Eastern tour group, Richard Dershimer said that in the districts they visited, the differences were striking. "They represented different communities rather than different innovations," he continued, "and they represented basically different administrative styles."

The first district visited (Manhasset) Dershimer labeled one of the best examples of what some people in education refer to as the public-private school. As is characteristic of some Northeastern private schools, much attention is paid to making the teacher supreme and autonomous. This has resulted in innovations that are primarily subject matter oriented and teacher centered.

Plainview, the second district, was characterized by growth in enrollment; since 1954 the enrollment has increased sixfold. Quite naturally, the innovations are most concerned with organization, use of media, and use of facilities. Dershimer said that Plainview is an excellent example of how outside funds can be used to initiate, but not pay for, innovations. For example, funds from two foundations launched a new library project, but the district is maintaining the program on an even higher level of cost and productivity.

In the third district, Newton, the change pattern reflected the belief in the autonomy and responsibility of the "house plan" principals. (An administrative arrangement, allowing more personal attention, wherein the school is divided into houses, each having a vice principal.) This district attempts to free teachers to try innovations that they deem important, and teachers are given extra time or extra pay for these efforts. The Newton district is also extensively involved with Boston-area universities, and specifically with university personnel.

Dershimer continued by listing some generalizations based on the observations of his group. "The influence and importance of community or societal factors in determining change were emphasized by this visit." This he qualified by stating that "while the community or society may set the forces in motion, the professionals still shape these forces." He noted that the districts lack clearly defined criteria for selection of innovations and consequently have no basis for evaluating the innovations.

No formal structure for change in school systems was observable, Dershimer concluded. This structuring can be accomplished only by clarifying the roles of the three basic institutions or agencies--the local districts, the state departments, and the teacher-preparing institutions--and aligning them in a purposeful system for change.

### 5. Summary of Tour Reports (Dan Prescott)

Dan Prescott, in presenting a summary statement following the tour leaders' reports, observed that many innovations are already in practice. They have been the result of: (1) technological advances; (2) recognition of the inhibiting effects of grade-level structures; and (3) critical situations. Innovations designed to negate grade-level structures--flexibility of group size, of process, of time, and of space--are most prevalent and of greatest import to education. Prescott also made three recommendations: (1) we need to develop models to study and analyze the causes of the problems that motivate changes; (2) we need to develop models of the process of change; and (3) we need to build in a system of record keeping that would make possible adequate evaluation of changes.

## E. SELECTED CONFERENCE ADDRESSES

SDC document TM(L)-2105, *Interim Report: Proceedings of the Conference on the Implementation of Educational Innovations*, provides the complete text of five conference addresses pertaining to the change process in education. For economy of space, this section of the final report presents a summarized version of only three of the major presentations that were made at the conference. For complete texts of all five addresses, attention is invited to the SDC Interim Report referenced above.

### 1. Keynote - "The Engineering of Change in Education" (David L. Clark)

David L. Clark, in his Keynote Address "The Engineering of Change in Education," charged that educators are avoiding the issues relevant to the process of change. He conceded that some change had occurred but that in any social process field, no matter how conservative, some change is forced by the pressure of events. This eventuality must not be taken as license for the evasion of the fundamental question: Do we have a program of planned change? It is perfectly clear that educators have not accepted the social psychologists' concept of planned change but instead have adopted a random intermittent approach to change.

Clark warned that a study must be made of the process of change. He noted that Henry M. Brickell's Organizing New York State Schools for Educational Change, though it contains some of the best information educators have on how change occurs in education, is still little more than a quasi-research project based chiefly on informal interviews.

Clark asked why educators resist programs of planned change, mentioning that three of these reasons were examined in a recent book, Innovation in Education, edited by Matthew B. Miles. Miles holds that resistance to this process of planned change revolves chiefly around three kinds of myths that have been perpetuated in the field of education: (1) that American schools are locally controlled; (2) that the school teacher is an independent and autonomous professional; and (3) that good teaching can never be effectively measured or specified except in intuitive terms.

None of the above statements leads to a useful operating definition of how the status of education is maintained at present, Clark claimed, although all may be partially true. Adding two more reasons for resistance to change, Clark stated first that the concept of planned change is both unfamiliar and uncomfortable, and further that it tends to conflict with certain philosophic positions relating to curriculum that are strongly held by some persons in the field. Belief in a concept such as the self-contained classroom he likened to a religious fervor. Second, he said, we develop a faith in research that leads us to think that the really powerful ideas growing out of research somehow implement themselves.

"We are going to have to study the process of change ourselves," Clark asserted, bluntly admitting that educators have too long expected that some other group would do their work for them. They have tried to use research from sociology or psychology to solve their problems, but this expectation is unreasonable. One of the first tasks in studying the process of innovation will be to clean up muddy terminology in the field so that everyone may understand what will be necessary to provide an operating mechanism for the creation of change. To this end, Clark suggested one conception of a complete program for change in a social process field, hoping that it would result in further discussion using a common terminology relating to processes necessary for change. (See Figure 1.)

### CHANGE IN A SOCIAL PROCESS FIELD

| | Research | Development | Dissemination | Demonstration | Implementation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Objective | To advance knowledge | To apply knowledge | To distribute knowledge | To build conviction | To facilitate action |
| Criteria | Validity of the knowledge produced | 1) Feasibility<br>2) Performance | 1) Intelligibility<br>2) Fidelity<br>3) Comprehensiveness<br>4) Pervasiveness | Credibility | 1) Effectiveness<br>2) Efficiency |
| Relation to Change | Provides basis for innovation | Produces innovation | Informs about innovation | Promotes innovation | Incorporates innovation |

Figure 1

The particular objective of research, Clark said, is to advance knowledge. The criterion for success is simply the validity of the knowledge that is produced. Research is related to change in that it may provide a basis for future innovations.

The objective of development, he continued, is the application of knowledge to the solution of a problem. The criteria for assessment of development are feasibility and performance. Development produces innovations, an objective different from that of research, and has a much more direct relationship or application to the process of change.

The objective of a program of dissemination is distribution of knowledge. The logical criteria that should be applied to a program of dissemination are intelligibility, fidelity, comprehensiveness, and pervasiveness. The dissemination program's relation to change is predicated on informing people about innovations. One does not measure a program of dissemination on the basis of whether or not change occurs.

The objective of a demonstration program is to build conviction in the practitioner, leading to promotion of innovation. Credibility is the sole criterion.

The last column on the chart (Figure 1) is labeled implementation. Implementation should facilitate action. This is the point at which change occurs, and the criteria of effectiveness and efficiency must be applied here, not to other areas. At the present time, Clark continued, we must use the research that we have, and through a development effort, create some applications to the problems facing the field. The production of innovations is necessary. As an example, Clark cited the body of research that has been developed during the past five or six years on creativity. He asserted the necessity of packaging the findings of this research in a usable, appealing form for use by school administrators and teachers if the result is to be--as it has not yet been--incorporation of research into practice. Dr. Clark held that without appealing packaging, change will occur, as it does at the present, on a random basis. The school systems will, as ever, have to create their own innovations, and if they must do this with the limited manpower and time available to them, it may take a very long time indeed. "It's not because they don't have the skill or the talent to do it," he explained. "it's because they're not organized to be developers."

Clark concluded by suggesting to the conferees that as they begin to examine the need for creation of such mechanisms for change as regional centers, demonstration schools, laboratory schools, and added personnel in state departments of education, they will bring the roles of various agencies into sharper focus within a framework of implementation of innovations and planned change.

2. "The Change Process" (Frank Jasinski)

Anthropologist Frank Jasinski expressed satisfaction that tour participants, when looking at innovations, asked "Do we need it?" not "Can we use it?" He said that, too often, "It's the case of innovation looking for a place to happen."

Jasinski then outlined common elements in innovational situations: (1) a recognized need for change--a problem that had to be solved; (2) early involvement of the implementers (the degree and timing of involvement seeming to bear a direct relationship to success); (3) dynamic leadership, especially at the level of implementation; and (4) recognition of the larger community, the larger environment--parents, school board, and large segments of the community.

In commenting on resistance to change, Jasinski cautioned that leaders of organizations need to be mindful of the environment and the culture that they create. Additionally, they need to examine rather carefully the kinds of behavior that they reward. Is this the behavior that is the most desirable?

Jasinski also talked about factors that contribute to resistance at the personal level. The individual sees "new behavior--which may be different, may be hard to incorporate, may require additional exertion. Unless he can see that this change is going to give him either a quicker access to his goal or to a greater variety of goals, he will tend to remain in his old pattern. "Resistance on the part of the individual," he continued, "is the fear of unknown consequences. The individual faced with this anxiety, apprehension, fear, usually tends to show hostility, or aggression, or just becomes apathetic."

Jasinski illustrated his points with anecdotes from his experiences in industry and then went on to summarize a six-point metaplan for change as follows:

a. set the objectives or definition of needs and get acceptance of them;

b. explore a set of alternatives or a variety of alternatives that might meet or satisfy these needs;

c. select an appropriate alternative suited to the specific local situation and limitations;

d. organize the introduction of change--set up controls, obtain materials required, plan timing of the introduction, note staff behavior changes required, and determine standards against which to measure achievement of objectives;

e. introduce the change as planned;

f. measure the results against your predetermined standards and take action as necessary, including canceling the change if appropriate.

In conclusion, Jasinski noted that individuals involved in a change must:

a. understand the reason for change;

b. recognize and appreciate how the change is going to affect them individually and collectively;

c. recognize that their behavior must change.

Innovators, however, must:

a. know the environment, the culture, the climate with which they are dealing;

b. look to their own organizations to see what kinds of motivations people have;

c. look to other agencies and individuals outside the immediate organization to determine what help they may be able to provide;

d. look at self-motivations.

### 3. "The Economic Necessity of Educational Change"(Ely Brandes)

In his opening remarks, economist Ely Brandes stated, "My thesis is simply that public education is heading for an economic crisis, and I view the current efforts to increase the efficiency of education through innovations as perhaps the most hopeful means for avoiding this crisis." In California, he said, the population increased at an average yearly rate of four percent between 1950 and 1962. The state's personal income increased at an annual rate of nine percent But the total spent on education by state and local government in the state has been growing at the rate of 14 percent per year.

Four major factors contribute to rising education costs, Brandes explained. The first two are growth factors--increase in school population and increases in teachers' salaries--both of which can be regarded as equivalent to the increase in income. The other two factors account for the disproportionate rise in cost of education; these he identified as the trend to provide more years of education per child and the continuing pressure for ever better education.

In looking ahead, Brandes predicted that "all of the conditions and factors that combined for the past growth in educational spending, far in excess of our growth in income, are still with us, and if there is no change introduced into the system, the requirements for money will continue to grow at pretty much the same rate." The implications of this statement, he warned, are clear. "If our spending for education grows faster than our income or the assessed value of property, which, incidentally, usually rises at just about the same rate as income, then paying for education requires an ever-increasing tax rise, either on income or property." He observed that California educators are clearly experiencing a rising resistance to increased spending for education.

Brandes concluded by suggesting that the solution depends on finding ways of improving quality and quantity of education without increasing costs. It is in some form of innovation, he predicted, that the answer will be found.

## F. INSTITUTIONAL AREA WORK GROUP REPORTS

### 1. Guidelines (John Caffrey and Don Bushnell)

John Caffrey, in his charge to the three work groups, reminded the participants that innovation and improvement are not synonymous. Innovation, he asserted, implies combining our traditions and our accumulated experience to the end that, through research, we may define and deliberately extend our experience. He said that we need to establish conditions that permit us to profit by and to use what we have learned.

Caffrey suggested that the work groups seek to identify: (1) the trends in innovation that seem most significant, those that hold the greatest hope for improvement of education; (2) the kind of leadership that brings about innovation; (3) obstacles that seem to prevent innovation; (4) motives involved in innovation; and (5) the proper role to be played in innovation by each agency or institution.

Don Bushnell expressed hope that each of the groups would submit a list of research questions that would lead to a better understanding of the process of change and that might identify important change factors as seen by each group.

2. University Work Group (Richard Featherstone)

Richard Featherstone reported that the university work group was concerned primarily with raising research questions aimed at identifying the activities in which universities were engaged that might contribute to the implementation of innovations. Additionally, they raised questions concerning the characteristics of innovations. Finally, they asked, "What is the specific task of the university in the process of evaluation of innovation? Do school districts that we know and work with really want universities to come into their districts and design some form of evaluative device or devices and proceed in the evaluative process?"

3. State Department Work Group (Lee Campion)

The state department work group report was presented by Lee Campion. The questions raised, all of which pertained to the role of the state department in the process of change, were summarized as follows:

a. How is the need for change determined?

b. What factors produce a need for change?

c. How do the regulatory functions of the state department affect change?

d. How does the staffing of the state department affect its role in change?

e. Should the state use its resources to influence change? How?

f. What is the state's role in research, development, implementation, evaluation, dissemination, and demonstration?

g. What should be the state's interactions with other states, the federal government, foundations, and other agencies?

Campion summarized: "We have discussed a system for implementing change and have concluded with the strong feeling that we do need a system for implementing change and we need to determine what the building blocks are for this system."

4. Administration Work Group (Ray Braun)

Ray Braun said that the administration group suggested the establishment of "some kind of yardstick whereby anticipated change and innovation could be evaluated and perhaps pretested, in terms of its contribution to the learning of children, before we actually try it out." To accomplish this, Braun suggested the following:

a. the development of a taxonomy and history of educational change and innovation, wherein innovations would be classified and categorized, historically reviewed, evaluated, and briefly discussed;

b. the development of a glossary or dictionary of educational terms that are likely to improve and clarify communication among educators, and between educators and other agencies working with education;

c. the development of processes that will make educational innovations more consistent with theories of learning, philosophies of education, and methods of teaching.

Braun then listed his groups' general questions related to the recurrent themes of identifying the factors in the process of change, identifying roles, and facilitating communication. Typical questions:

a. How can we make the results of research more readily available?

b. How can we define the distinctive roles of schools, state departments, and university personnel in effecting change?

## G. SEMINAR SESSIONS

A day and a half of the conference was devoted to seminars that discussed in detail each of the following topics: The Ungraded School, Putting Research Into Practice, Educational Media Centers, Planning for New School Facilities, The Role of the State in the Change Process, New Media and Technology, Flexible Scheduling, Team Teaching, New Curriculum Programs, Programed Instruction, Educational Data Processing Support, and the Community School. Participating in these seminars were innovators from districts visited during the traveling seminar and an additional group of prominent resource persons. A detailed report of each of the seminar sessions is contained in SDC document TM(L)-2105, Interim Report, and therefore will not be repeated in this document.

## H. FINAL TOUR GROUP MEETING SUMMARY

On the morning of May 19, the last day of the conference, the conferees again assembled by tour groups, this time to report on plans of action, questions still unanswered, reactions to the traveling seminars, conclusions agreed upon, and recommendations. Following the group meetings, Dan Prescott summarized the results of the four meetings.

"Enthusiasm, enthusiasm, enthusiasm for the experience we've had," began Prescott, "characterizes the responses of each group." Mixed contacts between state department members, superintendents, university people, and people from different areas of the country were especially valued.

One significant factor reported by the groups, Prescott continued, was that people now undertaking innovations felt greatly strengthened in their confidence to go farther or to follow through because they now feel they will have good support from other participants in the traveling seminars and from colleagues. Almost all participants said that they would like to revisit the same schools after two or three years to evaluate subsequent progress. Participants want to maintain correspondence and communication with fellow tour members; they show great interest in having a tour to see what university follow-up or innovations may emerge from the seminar and conference; and they strongly suggested that communication on change and the change process become an important aspect of the annual meeting of the American Association of School Administrators.

Two groups felt that they had received valuable insights into how leadership works and the characteristics of good leaders. One group reported that it had developed strong convictions that risk money is not only valuable but necessary in order to get innovations underway in schools speedily, and to carry these innovations through to adequate evaluation.

The coordination of research expenditure by state universities and departments of education, and by public schools was suggested; it would lead to rich flow of information and to more adequate evaluation of the factors that have influenced success, failure, adjustment or maladjustment of children.

Interstate and intrastate tours to see innovations were suggested in all four groups, and there was indication that some of the participants would take the initiative in implementing this suggestion. An almost unanimous view was that the groups should always represent a mix of university, state department, and administrative staffs. State and regional tours that would concentrate on specific innovations were recommended.

"The desirability of establishing cooperative ventures and the desire to do so--these bubbled up in great quantity almost everywhere," reported Prescott. Rather than visiting a high-level demonstration center, the participants recommended visits to regular schools. They believed that seeing innovations in operation, in the normal school situation, was more persuasive. One group reported that the idea of a field demonstration center was highly valuable. Three groups, in discussing it, felt that rather than field demonstration centers, field service centers were needed associated with local school systems. It was anticipated that "service in the field" truly would be the function of such a center.

## I. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

During the conference, and in subsequent SDC project staff contacts with participants, strong concern was expressed concerning the identification of variables that lead to success or failure of innovations introduced into an operational school system. More concern was expressed for the process of innovation than for any specific innovation itself. This does not imply that there was a lack of interest in the innovations. Rather, it suggests a search for ways of implementing new practices that hold promise for improvement of the educational program in schools.

### 1. Attitudes and Reactions

Reactions of the conference participants were highly enthusiastic and constructive. For example:

a. The interactions within groups resulted in the establishment of some new lines of communication, and the expressed intent of the participants was to maintain and reinforce these new lines.

b. The experience strengthened participants' confidence to attempt, and conviction to continue, innovations.

c. All participants were interested in follow-up activities.

d. A great number of the participating superintendents expressed a desire to be included in any follow-on activities and further volunteered to provide any data they have available that could contribute to the study.

e. At least two of the traveling seminar regional groups made firm plans to meet again to exchange information and reports of progress.

2. General Conclusions

Using the reports of the four regional tours and the results of the work sessions at the conference as a departure point, certain conclusions are suggested upon which further investigation can be based and from which guidance may be obtained in planning new programs. The conclusions most consistently expressed by the traveling seminar and conference participants were as follows:

a. Innovations are in practice in many schools throughout the country. Although more prevalent in districts with above-average financial support, innovations are found in some districts with limited resources.

b. There is a patent lack of research upon which to evaluate existing innovational practices.

c. Innovations tend toward accommodating the spread in pupil abilities and achievement by individualizing instruction. This is displayed by greater instructional flexibility in the use of space, time, methods, and group size.

d. Wherever innovations have been implemented, there is evidence of strong, positive, and dynamic leadership. This conclusion tends to support Brickell's conclusion that the superintendent is the primary agent.

e. Innovations often result from those crisis conditions that present problems needing new and dramatic solutions. Typical of such circumstances are radical population growth; major changes in the composition, structure, or economy of the community; and the onslaught of well-organized pressure groups.

f. Implementation is often facilitated by the acquisition of federal funds or foundation grants. These funds provide seed or risk money and incline to have a pump-priming effect.

g. There exists no structured program of planned change. No agency or institution is charged with the specific responsibility of aiding the implementation of innovations, nor is such responsibility designated in the formal line structure of school districts.

h. Laboratory schools and demonstration centers are thought to be miscast in the role of dissemination. They do not build conviction because they are not credible.

i. Although useful, the literature, conferences, work shops, and individual visitations are considered inadequate to the task of dissemination.

j. It is generally agreed that implementation comes after research and development, or design. The twenty-five to fifty-year lag or gap between research and implementation is attributed to a failure to take effectively the next step(s) of demonstration, dissemination, implementation and evaluation.

k. The consensus among the conferees was that demonstration centers (not a part of a local school district) and laboratory schools are not the dynamic needed to build conviction (because they lack credibility) or to facilitate action programs. Rather, most participants supported the position taken by Matthew Miles:[10]

> "Credibility often becomes crucial. It can be aided if a genuinely dispassionate group serves as a clearinghouse for information on an incipient innovation. In addition, structure which provides for peer communication appears helpful. Potential users of an innovation seem to trust the accounts of peers who have actually tried the innovation, and can testify as to its worth, give aid with skills required, etc.... The use of early adopters to stimulate awareness-interest is developed in agriculture; less so in education. It is suggested that support and conceptual help provided by consultants or other outsiders may be essential for adequate development of awareness-interest, and later adoption."

3. Recommendations

The recommendations that follow illustrate the general areas of agreement expressed by the conference participants. The SDC project staff is in agreement with these recommendations since they appear reasonable and justifiable in light of the general conclusions stated above.

a. Strong U. S. Office of Education, state department of education, and local school district support should be provided for the traveling seminar as a technique for bringing together key personnel who can influence the implementation of innovations. Specifically, participants recommended that:

---

[10] Miles, op. cit., p. 652.

1) Traveling seminars of this type should be continued.

2) Traveling seminars should be tried on regional and state levels.

3) Traveling seminars should be organized to explore other areas of concern such as school district organization, the change process, or data processing.

4) Any subsequent traveling seminars should be organized using the same representation of key personnel, i.e., local administrators, state department and teacher-training institution personnel.

b. Methods for the evaluation of innovations are needed. Examples:

1) a glossary of educational terms that would facilitate communication;

2) development of a taxonomy that would provide classification and categorization, evaluation and description, and historical background;

3) development of procedures for making research results more readily available;

4) exploration of the means of establishing cooperative efforts in all phases of the innovative process.

c. Searching, systematic, sophisticated research in reference to the process of change in education is needed.

d. Definition of the roles of various agencies and institutions in the change process--local districts, state departments, universities, federal government, foundations, etc.--is necessary. Interactions of such agencies and institutions must then be clarified.

e. Establishment of an outside agency or temporary system that would serve innovators and the innovation process is needed. Recommended strongly is a field service center organized to work cooperatively with all agencies and institutions attentive to or implicated in educational innovations. Such a center would:

1) serve as a base for dissemination;

2) coordinate and expedite demonstration;

3) provide ancillary resources to implementation;

4) be based on a foundation of voluntary participation and cooperation;

5) act as an intermediate agency between the user and the provider of seed monies or risk monies.

# PART III

# EVALUATION OF FIELD EXTENSION SERVICE CONCEPT IN EDUCATION

## A. INTRODUCTION

In any evaluation of the results of action of some kind, the major objective of measurement is essentially change. The action that is employed in a particular program or project is intended to bring about a change of some kind in the behavior, attitudes, environment, or organization of individuals or groups. In other words, social action is directed toward effecting change from a given situation or state that is considered inadequate or undesirable, to a different situation or state, one that is considered more adequate and more desirable.

In this project, the evaluation phase of the study was designed to assess the behavioral effects of the traveling seminar and conference experiences upon the school district participants approximately one year after the conclusion of the SDC conference in Santa Monica. This was accomplished by collecting both formal statistical data derived from questionnaire and interview instruments, and informal, anecdotal data obtained from written personal correspondence between the SDC project staff and participating school personnel.

This section of the final report is divided into two parts: the first provides the informal anecdotal data that were obtained from the traveling seminar and conference participants; the second part presents the formal statistical data associated with the measurement of change in innovational behavior one year later in those school districts that were represented in the participating tour groups.

## B. INFORMAL EVALUATION

Reactions to the traveling seminar and conference experiences, as reported in personal correspondence from the participants to SDC project staff members, have been uniformly favorable. Educators who took part in the seminars and follow-up conference appear to have been stimulated to use the same or similar techniques to generate interest in educational innovation, and to disseminate information about new techniques and programs to other educators in their own school systems. Several significant innovative activities and long-range action programs in various parts of the country have been directly attributed by the educators concerned to the seminar and conference experiences provided during the conduct of this project.

### 1. Action Programs

The following section describes the kinds of action programs that are presently in operation or under discussion for possible implementation.

a. Taylorville Traveling Seminar. The Taylorville Community Unit Schools, in Illinois, conducted a traveling seminar for its teachers modeled directly after the System Development Corporation Traveling Seminar. Forest L. DeWeese, Superintendent of Schools, announced that the seven-day seminar included visitations to six schools in order to observe "innovational practices already in existence in selected Illinois schools." A detailed summary of the Taylorville Traveling Seminar appears in Appendix D.

b. Ohio State Department of Education Traveling Seminar. The Ohio State Department of Education used the traveling seminar concept in their annual elementary school guidance conference. Announcing the conference, Dr. Charles E. Weaver, State Guidance Supervisor, stated:

> Inspired by the traveling seminars to observe innovations in education sponsored by System Development Corporation of Santa Monica, California, through a research grant with the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, twelve (12) traveling seminars have been planned as part of our Fourth Annual All Ohio Elementary School Guidance Conference.

Included with the announcement was a summary of the SDC Traveling Seminar by Dr. Weaver described in the September/October issue of the State Guidance Newsletter, Ohio Guidance News and Views. The Ohio Traveling Seminar program may be found in Appendix D.

c. New York State Education Department Center for Innovation in Education. Dr. Norman D. Kurland has been named Director of the Center on Innovation in Education for the New York State Department of Education. Dr. Kurland addressed the following letter to participants of the System Development Corporation Conference on the Implementation of Educational Innovations:

> As you will see from the enclosed press release, the New York State Education Department has taken a step to carry forward ideas developed during the conference. I should personally welcome from you any suggestions on how the Center might best operate. Proposals for specific projects from New York schools and colleges would be particularly welcome.
>
> My impression is that most of us found the seminar to be a very profitable experience. I would hope that our Center might be able to conduct such seminars on a state or regional basis and that many of those who participated in the first one would be able to join us.

A copy of this press release appears in Appendix D.

d. Midwest Tour Group Organization. A group of school superintendents who participated in the Midwest traveling seminar have organized informally to "facilitate an interchange of ideas, programs, and developments resulting from our most interesting week spent together." The first effort in this direction was the publication of a bulletin by the tour leader, Ralph D. Purdy, reporting educational activities and developments that have taken place in Michigan, Illinois, and Ohio as a result of the Midwest traveling seminar.

e. Illinois Plan of Action. A reunion of the Illinois members of the Midwest traveling seminar was held in Springfield, Illinois. The meeting was called by Warren Evenson, Director of Research and Curriculum, Department of Public Instruction, "to determine the implications of the traveling seminar concept for future research and development programs." Members of the State Department of Education were present and plans were made to organize a traveling seminar patterned after the Midwest seminar. The members agreed to meet again to present their recommendations to representatives of the State Department of Education, the State Superintendents Association, and the State School Boards Association, and to present a plan for the implementation of the recommendations.

f. Western Tour Group Organization. The entire Western group of traveling seminar participants plan to meet at least once a year on a formal basis to exchange ideas and programs stimulated by the traveling seminar and conference.

g. Use of Conference Materials. Various uses have been made of the materials developed from the traveling seminars and conference.

1) Malcolm A. Lowther, Professor, School of Education, University of Michigan, used the Interim Report of the traveling seminars and conference as a basic text for a graduate seminar in educational administration.

2) Henry M. Brickell, Coordinator, Services to Curriculum Study Groups, Educational Testing Service, reported:

> I have only glanced at TM-2105 (Interim Report), but I already have the impression that it is a gold mine of intriguing ideas about implementing educational innovations. I look forward to reading it in detail. ...last month in drafting a position paper on State-Federal Relations in Education for New York State Commissioner of Education, James E. Allen, Jr., I made very good use of some ideas covered at the Conference...

3) Clyde Campbell, Editor of The Community School and Its Administration, devoted the June 1964 issue to a report on the System Development Corporation conference.

h. Programs Under Discussion in Ohio. The following developments have been reported to be under discussion in Ohio resulting from the SDC Traveling Seminar and Conference.

1) Glenn A. Rich, Director, Elementary and Secondary Education, Ohio State Department of Education, has given some thought to holding a state conference devoted to innovational practices in education.

2) Five members of the Midwest traveling seminar from Ohio recommended the holding of a series of drive-in conferences devoted to innovational instructional practices.

3) The members of the traveling seminar have suggested a meeting in the fall to plan further steps for implementation of a program in Ohio.

i. Pennsylvania Tour Group Program. A group of school superintendents from Pennsylvania who were participants in the Eastern traveling seminar have organized themselves on an informal basis to visit each others school districts. Everett A. McDonald, Jr., Superintendent, Coatesville Public Schools, Pennsylvania reports:

2

> Three of us in this area who were part of the seminar have been meeting monthly with another local superintendent and are trying to develop some sort of inter-visitation ... We would hope in this manner to evaluate each other on a very high professional level and thereby both gain a great deal from the visit.

j. Maryland State Department of Education Project. A study has been undertaken by the Maryland State Department of Education to canvass the school districts of the state to record and assess innovations. In addition, a survey is being made of research activities of Maryland school personnel.

2. Anecdotal Data

The following section provides a sample of unsolicited statements received from participants in personal correspondence with the SDC project staff. The comments that follow represent subjective evaluations of the traveling seminar and conference. They are reported in anecdotal form and grouped according to certain types of statements.

a. Participants frequently expressed their appreciation of their involvement in the traveling seminars and felt that they had gained professionally from the experience.

> The recent seminar sponsored by the System Development Corporation, in which I was a participant, was most beneficial and enjoyable. I am sure all of us gained professionally from this experience and that it will help each of us to improve the school system in which he works. (Local school superintendent, Maryland)

> As a member of the recent traveling seminar, I wish again to express to you my deep appreciation for the excellent opportunity and experience. I do not know when I have had a more rewarding professional experience. (Local school superintendent, Maryland)

The experiences which you made possible for us were of great value. They were experiences which would be impossible to have in any other way. I wish again to thank you for making this trip possible. I am sure that the participants have received much good from it. (Local school superintendent, Maryland)

As one small voice, let me thank you and SDC for the unusual privilege of participating in the Traveling Seminar Project. It was a rare and highly beneficial experience. (Local school superintendent, New York)

I am writing to thank you for the opportunity to participate in the recent Conference on the Implementation of Educational Innovations. It was truly a pinnacle in educational experiences, and a practice that I trust will be continued. (State department of education representative, Ohio)

Just a short note to thank you for the opportunity to participate in the Conference on the Implementation of Educational Innovations. It was most worthwhile to examine educational innovations in the schools and it was equally exciting to share these experiences not only with my fellow superintendents but also with officials of state departments and colleges who would be interested in these phases of our public education program. The System Development Corporation were wonderful hosts and the conference from beginning to end was most enjoyable and profitable....highlight of my entire professional experience. (Local school superintendent, Pennsylvania)

The Traveling Seminar provided us with a comprehensive overview of promising educational innovations. The trip was richly rewarding in all centers. It was a privilege to be with you. We would like to have you visit our system. (Local school superintendent, Florida)

I am writing to indicate how much I enjoyed participating in the Santa Monica Conference. On reflection, it was certainly a most stimulating and valuable educational experience, not only for me, but also for my school system's having been chosen as one of the demonstration centers in the East. (Local school superintendent, New York)

I certainly enjoyed the experiences that I had as a member of the Traveling Seminar visiting your offices earlier this month. Not only was the experience very worthwhile professionally, but it was a very pleasurable one largely as a result of the excellent hospitality you and your staff showed us. (State department of education representative, Maryland)

> The seminar experience was wonderfully rewarding, and I appreciate the opportunity of having been included. Nothing quite substitutes for study of new practices and factors involved in change as actual observation and exchange of views with others who share the experience. (Local school superintendent, Ohio)

> Again, let me say that the whole experience was a profitable one for me and I am sure for all of those participating. (Local school superintendent, Maryland)

> I look back with a great deal of satisfaction to my association with the outstanding members of our tour group and the excellent experience in visiting schools and participating in the final seminar at Santa Monica. If you get to Detroit at any time in the future I hope you will make it a point to stop by Wayne State University. (University professor, Michigan)

> I am convinced that one of the great values was associating with so many capable, unaffected and personable human beings. (Local school superintendent, Illinois)

> This was an experience long to be remembered, and I feel most grateful to have been one selected to attend. (Local school superintendent, Illinois)

> I am sure that one of the concomitant values in such a seminar is not only the meeting of professional minds and the resultant report but the fine, firm fellowship established. After all, it is the human element that is most important in the troubled old world. You and Buford and Brown and all the others have had a good effect on us in Michigan... (State department representative to tour leader, Michigan)

> It was one of the finest professional experiences that I have ever had. (Local school superintendent, Michigan)

> I am still trying to assess our experiences. I am sure the tours will be on our minds for a long time to come. Thanks for making it possible. (Local school superintendent, New York)

b. Participants frequently mentioned the timeliness of the traveling seminars and the interest and enthusiasm generated by the project.

> I would like to take this opportunity to thank you and System Development Corporation for the fine things you are doing in support of public education. This tour of

outstanding schools and the innovations they are trying was indeed profitable and timely. The individual experiment you are doing in your own company seems to me to be one of the bright spots on the educational horizon for the years ahead. (Local school superintendent, Arizona)

You and your firm are to be congratulated on the extensiveness of this project as well as the very efficient manner in which it was planned and executed. (Local school superintendent, Maryland)

Please accept my thanks for a very interesting Conference on the Implementation of Educational Innovations. You and System Development Corporation came through with a most impressive program. (Local school superintendent, Ohio)

Congratulations. Dr. Weaver reports back to Ohio that your experiences are excellent. Wish to give a vote of thanks to System Development Corporation for their efforts in stimulating the progress of education. (Telegram from state superintendent of public instruction, Ohio)

I spoke with Paul Johnson, our director of instruction, upon his return from the recent week-end meeting which concluded the Traveling Seminar in your place. He came back with some good feeling about what we are doing, for the weekend provided a kind of leveling perspective and an opportunity to reflect upon the things we do on a day-to-day basis on a crisis schedule. (Visitation site, Michigan)

Now that I am back in the office I begin to see the program from a broader perspective. (Local school superintendent, Pennsylvania)

I am certain that the momentum gained at the Santa Monica Conference will not be lost as there was a wonderful base set for providing the kinds of information that would be profitable to any school district in the nation. (Local school superintendnet, New York)

Despite the concern about the time of the year during which this tour was held, I believe the timing was excellent. The school budgets had been approved, it was only one month to the end of the school year, the summer will give them an opportunity to reflect, and I believe in the fall, they will be pounding the desk for innovations. (University professor, New York)

Seminars of this type facilitate the introduction and use of innovations. (Local school superintendent, reported by tour leader, Midwest group)

I can use this (traveling seminar) in my work at the state level. (Local school superintendent, reported by tour leader, Midwest group)

c. Comments by participants indicated a real interest in following through with activities and innovational practices in their own school districts.

Each (seminar member) will go back to his field to implement some innovations observed, but of greatest value will be the stimulation to encourage carefully planned change. There is great transfer value. (Local school superintendent reported by tour leader, Midwest group)

I hope those of you in the System Development Corporation who planned and carried out the Conference on the Implementation of Educational Innovations are feeling good about the recent meeting. From the comments I heard from the tour participants, I believe they feel pleased with what they saw and heard, returning home with many ideas. In fact, one group I sat with had some informal plans for communicating among themselves the innovations they hoped to initiate. (Resource person)

I feel certain that a great deal should come as a result of this program. I personally have four or five ideas that I want to pursue as a result of suggestions that I heard or were given to me while on the tour. (Local school superintendent, Pennsylvania)

I have waited too long to thank you for including Mrs. Purl in the System Development Conference several weeks ago. Mabel was inspired by the whole proceedings and has made two reports to me regarding her experiences. Plans are being made for a conference with some of our key people so that they, too, may benefit from her report. I would like to add my thanks to Mrs. Purl's for the many courtesies extended to her. We would appreciate being included in future projects. (Local school superintendent, California)

The idea was a great one, and I believe there were many who were not only convinced, but inspired to make some modifications. (Local school district representative, Michigan)

> Each day, as I have a chance to reflect on my experiences during our recent trip, more ideas come to me for doing things differently in my school system. Although I am in a rather slow-growing community, and one with many traditions, as to how things were done in "the good old days," I believe some different things can be tried. (Local school superintendent, Maryland)
>
> Several of the superintendents in Maryland have been together since (the seminar) and, needless to say, some of the seminar experiences were prominent in our discussions. (Local school superintendent, Maryland)
>
> The letters which I continue to receive from members of the Midwest Seminar indicate a continuing and developing appreciation for the values received in the touring seminar and in the conference which followed it. It is my belief that these people will not only implement some of the innovations observed but that their patterns of leadership will be modified as a result of the ten days spent in a study of these patterns. (Tour leader, Midwest group)
>
> We are planning a meeting with the Illinois group for July 16 to evaluate the seminar and to see what we might do to encourage innovations in Illinois schools. (Local school superintendent, Illinois)
>
> It (seminar and conference) was truly a pinnacle of educational experiences, and one which I believe will have definite carry-over usage in working with the State Educational Staff with particular value to the Staff of the Division of Guidance and Testing and the counselors in the State of Ohio. (State department of education representative, Ohio)
>
> This fall, for the first time, we shall offer a course in education administration only for students from abroad. My plan is to have them visit some of these school districts particularly to see how helpful our work can be. (University professor, New York)

d. Participants also expressed enthusiasm for the traveling seminar technique as a method of disseminating information on educational innovations and several participants have reported similar programs in their own school districts.

The idea is very worthwhile and I was pleased at the many concrete things that the Eastern participants now plan to do as, I feel, a direct result of the seminar. (State department of public instruction representative, Pennsylvania)

I want to thank you again for the privilege of participating in the traveling seminar. It is an excellent method of disseminating information on new innovations. (Local school superintendent, Oregon)

May I again express my sincere appreciation for having had the opportunity to participate in the traveling seminar and conference. Some of us in Illinois have already met with state department personnel with the idea of planning this procedure on a state level. On the local district level, I am attempting to set up an interstate three-school traveling seminar for the first of November. (Local school superintendent, Illinois)

Just a note to say thanks and to express my appreciation for being able to be a participant in the traveling seminar program just completed. It was a tremendous idea and I hope enough recommendations from the participants have made it worthwhile. (Local school superintendent, Pennsylvania)

e. Many participants indicated their desire to become involved in another such project.

I hope it will be my good fortune to participate again some time. (Local school superintendent, Ohio)

Again, thanks very much for the opportunity to participate and may I assure you that if there is a follow-up or any way in which I can be of further service, please feel free to call upon me. (Local school superintendent, Pennsylvania)

This project struck a very responsive chord in me. I want you to know that, if there is any extension of this project or plans for similar ones, I would be pleased to serve as a resource person in some capacity. I say this both from the point of view of diffusing educational innovations and from the standpoint of the application of computer and data processing to education. (Local school superintendent, California)

I am indicating, too, my continued interest in participating in the project in any way you feel might be beneficial. Certainly if you are selecting a nucleus group to draw together some of the material developed, I would be most pleased to participate in this way. I am also available to serve in any way that you might be planning to follow through on this project--this participation could take the form of serving on a continuing committee, participating at the AASA and/or ASED meetings, or any other form of follow-up. (Local school superintendent, New York)

f. Comments and evaluations were also made with regard to the seminar and conference materials.

I was impressed with your presentations and the material you supplied. (Local school superintendent, California)

I was a participant in your recent Educational Innovations Conference and am quite anxious to receive a transcript of the proceedings before July 19, 1965. Any help in this matter will be appreciated. I intend to use the proceedings as basic material for a graduate seminar on educational administration. (University professor, Michigan)

I have only glanced at TM-2105 (Interim Report), but I already have the impression that it is a gold mine of intriguing ideas about implementing educational innovations. (Resource participant, New York)

I have just received my copy of the Proceedings of the Conference on Implementation of Educational Innovations and deeply appreciate your courtesy and that of your firm in sending it to me. I read it carefully last night and feel that you have done exceptionally well in reporting the discussions and conclusions of the Conference. (Local school superintendent, Arizona)

g. Participants also made recommendations for future traveling seminar projects.

1) A number of participants felt that the tour schedule was too heavy.

Schools with innovational practices should be visited for a sufficient period to permit study in depth. The length of time will be dependent upon the practices to be observed, but under normal circumstances two or three schools might be visited in one week. (Midwest tour leader)

Too crowded a schedule, not enough breaks. (Local school superintendent, Florida)

Planned too much for us in the time allowed. (Local school superintendent, Massachusetts)

I would like to suggest the (future) seminars be focused upon no more than two specific educational innovations. (State department of education representative, California)

No more than one school a day should be visited and the touring members should be given adequate opportunity to visit classrooms individually or in groups, and talk to the teachers and to the students. The evenings should be free for this is where the real communication takes place. (State department of education representative, California)

Days a little too long for absorption. (Local school superintendent, New York)

The membership was divided on the issue of a very tight schedule... Some wanted more free time. Others felt that more frequent rest and relaxation periods were needed in order to secure the full benefit from the visitations and discussions. Some expressed appreciation and approval for the schedule, saying that it was no more than that to which they were accustomed, and that they wanted to get the benefit of as many ideas as possible during the week devoted to the purpose. (Tour leader, Midwest group)

2) Others expressed the desire to visit schools outside of their own region.

Would like to have had more opportunities for interchange between small groups from different areas. (Local school superintendent, New York)

Would have liked to visit other areas. (Local school superintendent, Florida)

Bull sessions were very valuable, learned a lot but would have preferred visitations outside my region. Would pay my own expenses for a repeat of this kind of experience. (Local school superintendent, Florida)

3) One participant cautioned on the importance of avoiding suspicion caused by demonstrations.

> Any administrator knows that he can put on a show for a visitor if he can control what classes they visit, whom they talk with, and the length of time they are in the building. Suspicion of the visitor is a serious factor in the effectiveness of a touring seminar and every effort should be made to minimize this suspicion. (State department of education representative, California)

4) One participant suggested that careful effort be given to matching the visitor with the school district.

> The visitors are selected from school districts which can identify the districts visited. By this I mean that we do not take superintendents from small rural school districts and have them visit large metropolitan areas. (State department of education representative, California)

## C. FORMAL EVALUATION

This section presents the results of the formal evaluation phase of the project. Two statistical analyses were conducted in order to assess the effects of the traveling seminar and conference upon the participants. The first analysis was concerned with an empirical evaluation of the SDC Traveling Seminar and Conference in Santa Monica; the second involved research related to certain correlates of innovational behavior in school districts. The results of these analyses will be described in two parts: (1) evaluation of the traveling seminar, and (2) correlates of innovational behavior.

### 1. Evaluation of the Traveling Seminar

The normal method of evaluating seminars, conferences, and workshops is to use anecdotal records or evaluation questionnaires filled out by the participants. Such procedures are proper since the objectives of conferences and workshops are usually attitudinal changes that are difficult to assess by any objective means. One of the objectives of the SDC Traveling Seminar and Conference was to give educational decision makers tools that would expedite innovational behavior in their districts. In order to evaluate this objective, the anecdotal data were supplemented by obtaining a measure of innovational behavior from a sample of the participating districts. This measure was repeated one year later and the growth or the gain in innovational behavior was computed. This gain in innovational behavior for the sample of participating districts was compared to the gain in a comparable sample of districts whose superintendents did not participate in the seminar and conference.

a. Sampling Procedures. In this study, 46 of the 60 participating districts were used. Fifty-seven comparable districts were used as a control group. The control districts were primarily those who were invited to participate but because of previous commitments could not do so. All the districts, both participants and control, were selected from a list of school districts with a known interest in educational innovations. Some were suggested by tour leaders and state departments of education, some mentioned in previous innovational research and some participated in previous projects. The final sample consisted of 103 districts, 46 participating and 57 control. Clearly, these samples are not representative of any large population of school districts. However, there appears to be no systematic difference between the two samples, and a wide variety of schools is represented in each.

b. Data Gathering Procedures. Before participating in the seminar and conference, all the superintendents or their designated representatives responded to a questionnaire concerning the nature of educational innovations in use in their districts and the extent of such use. A facsimile of this questionnaire appears in Appendix C of this report. Approximately one year later, the superintendents participated in a structured interview which requested information about the school district. The superintendent or another knowledgeable person in the district was again queried about educational innovation and the amount of change over the previous year.

All the data from the questionnaires and interviews were coded in a form suitable for electronic data processing. An innovational index was computed for each district for 1964 and again for 1965. From the questionnaire and interview data, SDC project staff personnel scaled each innovation mentioned on a 0-4 scale. The key to the scale was as follows:

0 = Not presently in use or planned for

1 = Not presently in use but definitely planned for the following year

2 = Presently in use on an experimental basis only

3 = Presently in partial use

4 = Presently in use with maximum influence on the curriculum

The score given each innovation was added for each of the two years. The total score for each year was considered the innovational index for that year. The growth in innovational behavior was defined by the difference between the 1964-1965 innovation indices.

c. Statistical Procedures and Results. Two statistical procedures were carried out to test the significance of the difference between the mean innovational gain scores of the participant and control groups.

The mean innovational indices for the districts broken down by participation and geography appear in Table 1.

Table 1

Mean Innovational Index for Participants and Non-Participants by Geographic Location and Year

| | | No. of Cases | 1964 | 1965 | Change | Mean Gain |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Participants | East | 14 | 34.7 | 39.5 | 4.8 | |
| | South | 12 | 23.2 | 29.5 | 6.3 | |
| | Midwest | 12 | 25.2 | 31.9 | 6.7 | |
| | West | 8 | 19.6 | 29.4 | 9.8 | |
| | | | | | | 6.6 |
| Non-Participants | East | 15 | 27.0 | 31.7 | 4.7 | |
| | South | 14 | 17.9 | 21.7 | 3.8 | |
| | Midwest | 14 | 23.9 | 28.5 | 4.6 | |
| | West | 14 | 26.3 | 29.5 | 3.2 | |
| | | | | | | 4.1 |

A two-way analysis of variance was computed using the gain score as the dependent variable. The dimensions of this analysis were participant-control and the four geographic areas represented by the sample school districts. The results of this analysis appear in Table 2.

Table 2

Analysis of Variance of Innovational Change Scores

| Source | Sums of Squares | Mean Square | Degree of Freedom | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Participant | 198.59607 | 198.59607 | 1 | 10.84267 |
| Geographical Area | 42.24579 | 14.08193 | 3 | .76883 |
| Interaction | 124.93274 | 41.64425 | 3 | 2.27363 |
| Error | 1740.03589 | 18.35605 | 95 | |
| | 2105.80969 | | 102 | |

It will be seen that "participation" yielded an F ratio of 10.84 which, with 1 and 95 degrees of freedom, is significant at the .01 level of confidence. This indicates that the mean gain score for the participating districts (6.6) is significantly greater than the gain of the control sample (4.1).

Because of the intrinsic difficulties with difference scores, particularly their assumption of linearity, an analysis of covariance was computed on the 1965 innovational indices with the 1964 index as the covariant. The results of this analysis appear in Table 3.

Table 3

Analysis of Covariance in the 1965 Innovational Index
(1964 Innovational Index is the Covariant)

| Source | Adjusted Sums of Squares | Adjusted Mean Square | Degree of Freedom | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Participant | 205.59473 | 205.59473 | 1 | 11.20038 |
| Geographical Area | 35.88184 | 11.96061 | 3 | .65159 |
| Interaction | 105.08203 | 35.02734 | 3 | 1.90822 |
| Error | 1725.46875 | 18.35605 | 94 | |
| | 2072.02735 | | 101 | |

It is obvious from the F of 11.2 for "participation" that the results of the first analysis of variance were substantiated.

d. Discussion. It was evident from observation during and after the seminar that this experience was successful in creating enthusiasm and interest in the participants. In conversation with conference attendees, the project staff received many spontaneous comments and reactions, almost all of which indicated that assistance and benefit were derived by the participating school superintendents. Moreover, the statistical analyses indicate that those school districts that were represented at the conference actually initiated more innovation than a comparable set of districts that were not represented, a particularly impressive finding in view of the long delays normally experienced in the adoption of innovation.

The statistics must, of course, be viewed with caution. A number of alternate explanations for the results are possible.

The innovational index was computed from verbal reports of the superintendents of schools. It is certainly possible that superintendents who have been exposed to, and made aware of, educational innovations could perceive their districts differently after such an exposure, and their verbal report represents a change in perception rather than a change in actual innovational behavior. Nevertheless, the F ratios tend to support the anecdotal evaluation, which indicates that the traveling seminar and conference was highly effective.

2. Correlates of Innovational Behavior. This analysis was undertaken to determine what measurable attributes of a school district are related to the reported innovational behavior of the district. In order to determine this, a large number of facts and opinions were collected from personnel in the 103 school districts.

    a. Sampling Procedures. The sample for this study consisted of 103 school districts selected from a list of districts with known interests in educational innovations. Most of the 103 districts came from the states of Maryland, Florida, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, California, and Arizona. They varied in size, structure, and type. The only population of which they are representative is that defined by the original list of districts.

b. Data Gathering Procedures. There were three sources of data for this study. One, from which the dependent variable or innovational index was derived, was a questionnaire asking the superintendent or his designated representative about the educational innovations in his district and the extent of their use. The other two were structured interview forms. One of these contained factual data about the district's size, economics, social milieu, personnel policies and educational facts. The second interview form contained the impressions of the superintendent concerning the origins and the forces contributing to the support and deterrence of educational innovation in the district. Some of the items on this form contained the trained interviewer's impressions of the superintendent in his relationship to the district. The questionnaire and both interview forms are reproduced in Appendix C.

The data collected about each district were coded for tabulation by electronic data processing techniques and arranged in five distinct categories. Each category was coded on a separate card.

Ecological Data - This card contained measures of size, population density, social structure of the district, etc.

Budget Data - This card contained all the collected information concerning the economy of the district, including total budget, teacher salary, federal money, etc.

Personnel Data - This card described the certificated personnel in the district in terms of numbers, degrees, experience, etc.

Attitude Data - This card contained the interviewer-scaled opinions of the superintendents about innovations in the district. These data were collected for 55 of the 103 districts.

Innovation Card - This card contained scaled data concerning each innovation considered by the district.

A total of 72 variables (71 predictors and one dependent variable) were collected and extracted by project personnel from the questionnaires and interview data. In many instances, scaling procedures were used to quantify the information supplied by the district. The greatest difficulty in scaling resulted from the difference in administrative organization of the districts. The concern of the present study was with secondary districts only. However, "secondary" is interpreted as anything from the seventh to the fourteenth year of school and the administrative organizations varied from a 6-3-3-2 to a 6-6 school district. For the purposes of this study, grades 9-12 were considered the secondary school and all data were scaled accordingly to fit this paradigm. The overall innovational index for 1965 as described above was used as the dependent variable.

c. Statistical Procedures and Results. Project personnel made an a priori selection of 30 of the 71 available variables. A matrix of correlations for all 71 potential predictors and the dependent variable was computed. The predictor variables used for the final analysis was made from a combination of the rational validity defined by the a priori prediction and the empirical data defined by the linear correlation of each predictor with the criterion. Using this procedure, 14 potential predictors were selected to be used in the multiple correlation; these are listed in Table 4 with their validity coefficients.

Table 4

Predictors Selected for Multiple Regression and Their Correlations with the 1965 Innovational Index

| Variable | Validity Coefficient |
|---|---|
| Highest Teacher Salary | .53 |
| Superintendents' Ambition | .51 |
| Superintendents' Autonomy | .50 |
| High School Density | .44 |
| Population Density | .42 |
| Effect of Innovations on Finances | .40 |
| Social Class | .36 |
| Effect of Innovations on the Organization | .34 |
| Percentage of Jews | .32 |
| Percentage Going to College | .32 |
| Influence of the Board of Education on the Implementation | .30 |
| Community Support for Innovations | .30 |
| Percentage Completing High School | .27 |
| Urbanity | -.42 |

Of these, eight variables represented factual data about the district and six variables were extracted from the interview form. These six described superintendent and interviewer scaled opinion.

Two computer runs were made on a multiple correlation program. One used all fourteen predictor variables and one used only the eight factual variables. The reason for this decision was twofold: First, using the interview variables would introduce an unequal "N" into the routine and consequently make the significance of any findings difficult to interpret. Second, if the resulting regression equation was to be useful in estimating innovational behavior, the basis of the predictor variables should be such that they are easily obtained from facts about the district, and not dependent on personal interviews.

The multiple correlation coefficient on the first analysis was .78. The multiple "R" using two variables, "Highest Teacher Salary" and "Superintendents' Ambition," was .66. Adding a third variable, "Effects of Innovations on the Organization" increased this to .70. The further addition of "High School Density" resulted in a multiple "R" of .73 and the five variable multiple adding "Influence of the Board of Education on Implementation" resulted in a .77 correlation.

The total multiple "R" using the eight factual variables was .63. Using only two of these, "Highest Teacher Salary" and "High School Density," resulted in a multiple "R" of .60. Adding "Urbanity," a dichotomous variable, increased the multiple "R" to .61. The further addition of "Social Class" increased the multiple "R" to .63, with the remaining variables a practical irrelevance to regression.

d. Discussion. It would appear from the data reported above that a large number of easily collected pieces of information are related to the reported innovational behavior of school districts. Other than the empirical results, the following points seem worth exploring:

1. Other than "Highest Teacher Salary Paid," none of the fiscal variables appear related to innovational behavior.
2. Many of the variables having the highest validities are of a nature that cannot be easily changed.
3. A rationally related conglomerate of variables indicating the upper middle class community seem to influence innovational behavior a great deal. These would include "Urbanity," "Population Density," "Percentage of Jews," and "Social Class." A factor analysis of these data might lead to a "Suburban Factor" which, in turn, might be an excellent predictor of innovational behavior.
4. Though no causality is implied by the correlations, the data indicate a fruitful area for research in influencing the innovational behavior of school districts.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

## PART IV
## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

### A. INTRODUCTION

The principal objective of this project was to test the effectiveness of the field extension service concept as a method for disseminating information concerning educational innovations. The regional traveling seminars and conference were designed to assess the effects of field site visits and demonstrations of innovative practices in operational school situations upon the participating educators. Of particular interest was the determination of whether these school officials, under the guidance of a field service or "change" agent, would tend to introduce or expand new practices in their own schools after exposure to innovational experiences in comparable school districts. Another important objective of the project was to identify significant variables that may be related to successful implementation of innovations in schools. Of particular concern were the economic, educational, personnel, and size variables of school districts.

This section presents the major conclusions of the project, provides recommendations concerning further use of the field extension service concept in education, and identifies needed research programs.

### B. CONCLUSIONS

Part III of this report provided a detailed report of evaluative data, both formal and informal, related to the empirical testing of the traveling seminar and conference as a field extension service technique for accelerating educational innovation. The following conclusions were derived from analyses of the research data contained in Part III, by examination of the formal statements and reports made by seminar and conference participants, as detailed in Part II of this document, and, finally, from personal observations of the SDC project staff.

1. The traveling seminar and conference, a "field service" concept, is a highly effective dissemination method for stimulating and facilitating educational innovation.

   The statistical analyses of innovational practice by participating superintendents after tours to comparable school districts provided practical as well as statistically significant evidence that the traveling seminar is a sound dissemination technique. School districts that participated in the traveling seminars and follow-up conference were found to have initiated more innovations in their schools one year later than a comparable group of districts that did not participate in the tour-conference experience.

   The implementation of a number and variety of new action programs by the participating educators in various regions of the country offers additional evidence of the effectiveness of the field service concept as a dissemination instrument for effecting changed practice.

   Attitudinal data derived from field site interviews and personal correspondence between the tour participants and the SDC project staff also confirm the effectiveness of the traveling seminar as a dynamic method for dissemination of new ideas and acceleration of educational innovation.

2. There are measurable attributes of school districts related to the innovational behavior of these districts.

Statistically significant correlations were found to exist between innovational behavior in the participating school districts and certain interrelated variables generally associated with upper middle class communities. Environmental factors found to influence innovation in schools were "Urbanity," "Population Density," "Percentage of Jews," and "Social Class." These variables had high correlations, but by their nature, are not amenable to change. Although considered to be useful predictors, they have little potential for changing innovational behavior in schools.

Two highly significant predictor variables, "Highest Teacher Salary" and "High School Density," were also found to be associated with educational innovation. Implied in these findings are the limitations inherent in the small high school and the poorly paid teacher.

Though no causality is implied by the correlations, the data indicate a fruitful direction for research in determining new areas for influencing the innovational behavior of schools. A factor analysis of the variables listed above might lead to a "suburban factor," which, in turn, could be an excellent predictor of innovational behavior in a school district.

It is interesting to note that in this sample of school districts the statistical analysis of a number of fiscal variables thought to be important in affecting innovation did not, with the exception of one, result in significant correlations. The only fiscal variable that was found statistically significant was "Highest Teacher Salary." Despite generally accepted notions to the contrary, fiscal variables were apparently not as important as other factors in facilitating changed educational practice in the schools involved.

3. The attitude of the local superintendent of schools toward innovation is a significant variable in the introduction of innovations in school districts.

The findings in this study indicated that the ambition (an attitude) and the leadership (a skill) of the superintendent of schools were related to the innovational behavior of the school district. The implementation of successful innovations in schools tended to be found wherever there was evidence of strong, positive, and dynamic leadership behavior by the local superintendent.

The data from this project support the contention of Brickell and other investigators that the superintendent is the key figure in implementing new practices in schools.[11] Innovations of major scope, those that require significant changes in the content and methods of instruction, the use of time, space, and facilities, require active support from the superintendent if they are to be successful in school programs.

---

[11] Brickell, H. M. Organizing New York State for Educational Change. Albany, New York: State Education Department, December, 1961, p. 23.

## C. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations appear reasonable and justifiable in light of the conclusions reached during this study:

1. The traveling seminar and conference technique should be expanded and actively supported by adequate financial resources as an effective dissemination activity for spreading innovation by the U. S. Office of Education, state departments of education, and local school districts. The results of this study indicate that on-site observations and demonstrations of new programs under realistic operational conditions, and in school settings that are similar to those experienced by the observer in his own school district, are very effective methods for influencing changed practice in schools.

2. The traveling seminar and conference technique should be considered for incorporation in the dissemination programs of the planned U. S. Office of Education regional laboratories for research and development, under Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The specific inclusion of "dissemination" activities in the Title IV program authorization makes this an explicit mission and allows for the exploration of new methods and techniques for widespread diffusion of promising innovations throughout the planned national network of regional centers.

The traveling seminar concept could be used to disseminate new ideas and techniques in electronic data processing, school district organization, computer-assisted instruction, vocational education, curriculum development, new educational media, team teaching, non-graded classes and other innovations.

3. Future traveling seminars, if they are to be conducted successfully, should be planned and organized in the following manner:

   a. The number and variety of subjects to be investigated should be restricted to either:

      1) grouping, scheduling, organization, or
      2) curriculum and methods.

   b. In addition to administrators and personnel from state education departments and universities, traveling seminars should include supervisors, teachers, school board members, educational specialists, and community group representatives.

   c. At least six months should be allowed for adequate preparation to include:

      1) selection of leaders, participants, and visitation sites;
      2) opportunity for participants to indicate their primary interests which will, in turn, provide guidance for the school district and individual school selection process;

3) participants should be provided with information about purposes, procedures, and the school situation to be visited;

4) complete briefings should be given for visitation site personnel concerning the purposes of the visitation, what is required of them, and their specific responsibilities.

d. Approximately half of the participants should be persons with the responsibility and the authority to undertake or facilitate implementation.

e. Visitations should be long enough to allow time for "give and take" between the innovators and the visitors. One day per school or two days per system is suggested as a reasonable time period.

f. A mechanism should be established for continued interactions and communications (among participants as well as between traveling seminar staff and participants) upon completion of the traveling seminar.

g. Visitees should be surveyed after seminar tours in order to determine the effects of the visits upon their school districts.

4. Substantial expansion of present limited research efforts should be devoted to planned change in education. The participants in this study were in complete agreement that present attempts by educators to use research results concerning the process of change from sociology, psychology, and other disciplines are unsatisfactory. A strong, well-supported, national research program involving comprehensive studies

of the process of change in education is needed to provide solutions to a number of innovational problems in schools.

Certain specific areas of inquiry are recommended:

a. The respective roles of various agencies and institutions in the change process need to be defined. Local school districts, state departments of education, universities, the federal government, foundations, outside research and development organizations, non-profit companies, and many community groups have interest in and capabilities for improving educational programs in schools. The individual contributions of these groups, as well as the nature of desirable interactions among them, need to be studied as they affect planned change in education.

b. Research efforts should be devoted to definition of a desirable structure for implementing planned change in education. No agency or institution is presently charged with specific responsibility for aiding the implementation of innovations, nor is such responsibility designated in the formal line structure of local school districts.

c. Research attention should be directed toward the development of more effective methods for evaluation of innovations in education. There is presently a lack of research evidence upon which educational innovations can be evaluated with any degree of validity.

d. Research program efforts should also place emphasis upon the development of simulation models whereby planned innovations in schools can be pretested and analyzed in terms of their effects upon the school program before they are actually introduced. Models should also be developed to study and analyze problem situations in schools that lead to change, models of the process of change itself, and models which permit educators to evaluate adequately the effects of change.

e. Finally, research attention needs to be given to the development of information that would enable educators to more adequately understand and plan for implementing change in schools. The traveling seminar participants offered the following programs for consideration:

1) Development of a taxonomy and history of educational change and innovation, wherein innovations could be classified and categorized, historically reviewed and evaluated.

2) Development of a glossary or dictionary of educational terms that are likely to improve and clarify communication among educators, and between educators and other agencies working with the educational community.

3) Development of processes that will make educational innovations more consistent with theories of learning, philosophies of education, and methods of teaching.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

# APPENDICES

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

## APPENDIX A

## PROGRAM: A CONFERENCE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF EDUCATIONAL INNOVATIONS

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

## A CONFERENCE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF EDUCATIONAL INNOVATIONS

System Development Corporation, Santa Monica, California

| TIME | PROGRAM |
|---|---|
| Saturday, May 16<br>4:00 - 5:30 | First General Session<br>Presiding: Don D. Bushnell, Project Director<br>Welcome to SDC: William W. Parsons Vice President, SDC<br>Welcome to Conference: John Caffrey Manager, Education Projects, SDC<br>Welcome to Conference: David Ryans, Head, Education Research and Training Staff, SDC<br>Address: David L. Clark, Associate Dean, College of Education, Ohio State University, "The Engineering of Change in Education" |
| 6:00 - 8:30 | Reception and Dinner |
| Sunday, May 17<br>1:00 - 2:45 | Second General Session<br>Presiding: Dan Prescott, Professor of Education, University of Maryland<br>Announcements: Malcolm Richland<br>Traveling Seminar - Tour Leaders' Reports<br>WEST - Hollis Moore, Dean, School of Education University of Arizona<br>MIDWEST - Ralph Purdy, Professor of Education, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio<br>SOUTH - James A. Sensenbaugh reporting for C. Taylor Whittier, Montgomery County Superintendent of Schools, Maryland<br>EAST - Richard Dershimer, Director, Office Special Research Projects, Department of Public Instruction, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania |

2:45 - 3:00 Coffee

3:00 - 3:20 Summary Statement: Dan Prescott

3:20 - 4:00 Address: Frank Jasinski
"The Change Process"
Charge to Institution Area Work Groups:
John Caffrey and Don D. Bushnell

UNIVERSITY GROUP
Chairman: Hollis Moore
STATE DEPARTMENT GROUP
Chairman: Richard Dershimer
ADMINISTRATION GROUP
Chairman: Ralph Purdy

Monday, May 18
9:00 - 9:45 Third General Session

Presiding: John Caffrey
Announcements: Robert Freeman
Address: Ely Brandes, Economist,
Stanford Research Institute,
Palo Alto, California

9:45 - 10:00 Coffee

10:00 - 10:30 Reports from Institutional Area Work Groups

10:30 - 11:00 Summary Statement: Dan Prescott

11:00 - 12:30 Seminar Sessions

"The Ungraded School"
Chairman: Woodrow Darden
Discussants: John Cropp
William Lacy
"Putting Research Into Practice"
Chairman: David Clark
Discussants: Paul E. Johnson
Raymond Collins
"Educational Media Centers"
Chairman: Robert Savitt
Discussant: Amo DeBernardis
"Planning for New School Facilities"
Chairman: Charles D. Gibson

12:30 - 1:30 Lunch

1:30 - 3:00 Seminar Sessions

"The Role of the State in the Change Process"
  Chairman: Henry Brickell
"New Media and Technology"
  Chairman: James Finn
  Discussants: Don D. Bushnell
    John Coulson
"Flexible Scheduling"
  Chairman: Dwight Allen
  Discussants: Delbert Lobb
    Fred Converse
"Team Teaching"
  Chairman: Harris Taylor
  Discussants: Woodrow Zaros
    Edgar Bernstein

3:00 - 3:15 Coffee

3:15 - 4:45 Seminar Sessions

"New Curriculum Programs"
  Chairman: Margaret Gill
  Discussant: Thomas Lee
"Programmed Instruction"
  Chairman: Harry Silberman
"Educational Data Processing Support of Educational Change"
  Chairman: John Caffrey
  Discussant: John Cogswell
"The Community School"
  Chairman: Howard Nunn
  Discussant: Peter Clancy

5:00 Assemble in Commons Room

5:30 - 7:00 Dinner

7:30 - 9:00 Fourth General Session

Presiding: Malcolm Richland
Announcements: Robert Freeman

| | |
|---|---|
| | Address: Kal Porter, Porter-Gogerty-Meston Associates, Architects and Engineers, "New Designs in School Construction"<br>Film: Dwight Allen, "Flexible Scheduling"<br>Address: Don D. Bushnell, "The Future Use of the Computer in Education" |
| Tuesday, May 19<br>9:00 - 10:30 | Fifth General Session<br>Presiding: John Caffrey<br>Final Meeting of Tour Groups<br>WEST - Hollis Moore<br>MIDWEST - Ralph Purdy<br>SOUTH - C. Taylor Whittier<br>EAST - Richard Dershimer |
| 10:30 - 10:45 | Coffee |
| 10:45 - 12:00 | Summary Statement: Dan Prescott<br>Closing Address: Launor F. Carter, Vice President, SDC |

# APPENDIX B

# TRAVELING SEMINAR TOUR ITINERARIES

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Itinerary of Western Group of Traveling Seminar
Dr. Hollis Moore, Tour Director

Monday
May 11, 1964: The group will assemble at 12 noon at TIDELANDS MOTOR INN, 919 North Stone, Tucson, Arizona, where 15 double rooms with twin beds and 1 single room are reserved for the nights of May 11 and 12. Air travelers may call the Tidelands for courtesy limousine pickup, telephone 792-2663.

A conference room has been reserved for early afternoon of May 11 and for the evening of May 12.

Taxis may be utilized for local transportation.

Wednesday
May 13, 1964: The group will be limousined to the Tucson airport from and as a courtesy of the Tidelands Motor Inn and will depart Tucson at 10:41 a.m. on CONTINENTAL FLIGHT 211, arriving at Los Angeles International Airport at 12:31 p.m. Lunch will be served in flight.

Upon arrival in Los Angeles, the group will walk from the Continental Satellite through the connecting tunnel to the United Airlines Satellite and depart Los Angeles at 1:20 p.m. on UNITED FLIGHT 73, arriving at San Francisco International Airport at 2:20 p.m. It is recommended that luggage be checked at Tucson through to San Francisco. Lunch will be served in flight.

The group will be met at San Francisco airport by limousines from RICKEY'S HYATT HOUSE, 4219 El Camino Real, Palo Alto, California, where 15 double rooms with twin beds and 1 single room are reserved for the nights of May 13, 14, and 15.

A conference room has been reserved at Rickey's Hyatt House for the evenings of May 13, 14, and 15.

Taxis may be utilized for local transportation.

Saturday
May 16, 1964: The group will be limousined to the San Francisco airport by Rickey's Hyatt House and will depart San Francisco at 9:55 a.m. on UNITED FLIGHT 106, arriving at Los Angeles International Airport at 10:58 a.m.

The group will be met at Los Angeles airport and transported by chartered bus to the BEL AIR SANDS HOTEL, 11461 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles 49, California.

Single rooms and double rooms with twin beds have been reserved at the Bel Air Sands Hotel for seminar members for the nights of May 16, 17, and 18.

Conference facilities will be provided at System Development Corporation Offices, 2500 Colorado Avenue, Santa Monica, California.

Transportation between the Bel Air Sands Hotel and the SDC Offices will be by buses chartered by SDC.

Tuesday
May 19, 1964: Please observe hotel check-out time.

Conferees will be transported to SDC Offices on the morning of the last day of the conference. Each will be issued individual airline tickets to his home city at the close of the conference. Chartered bus transportation from the SDC Offices to the Los Angeles International Airport will be provided by SDC.

SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Itinerary of Midwestern Group of Traveling Seminar
Dr. Ralph D. Purdy, Tour Director

| | |
|---|---|
| Monday<br>May 11, 1964: | The group will assemble at 12 noon at HOWARD JOHNSON'S MOTOR LODGE, G-3129 Miller Road, Flint, Michigan, where 15 double rooms with twin beds and 1 single room are reserved for the night of May 11. Air travelers may call Howard Johnson's for courtesy limousine pickup--telephone 742-8735.<br>Conference room and local transportation will be provided by the Mott Foundation. |
| Tuesday<br>May 12, 1964: | Please observe motel check-out time.<br>Two Hertz cars will be delivered to Howard Johnson's Motor Lodge at 2:30 p.m.<br>Unit One of 6 people will depart in one Hertz car for Pontiac, Michigan, where 3 double rooms with twin beds are reserved at the EDGEWATER BEACH MOTOR LODGE, 3664 Dixie Highway, Pontiac, Michigan, for the night of May 12.<br>Unit Two of 6 people will depart in the other Hertz car for Livonia, Michigan, where 3 double rooms with twin beds are reserved at HINES PARK MOTEL, 37001 Ann Arbor Road, Livonia, Michigan, for the night of May 12.<br>The Hertz cars may be utilized for local transportation in Pontiac and Livonia.<br>A chartered Indian Trails bus will pick up Unit Three of 19 people at Howard Johnson's Motor Lodge, Flint, at 2:30 p.m., and depart for Battle Creek, Michigan, where 9 double rooms with twin beds and 1 single room are reserved at the HOLIDAY INN, Battle Creek, Michigan.<br>A conference room has been reserved at the Holiday Inn, Battle Creek, for the evening of May 12.<br>Local transportation in Battle Creek will be provided by local school officials. Taxis may be utilized if required. |

Wednesday
May 13, 1964: Please observe motel check-out time.

Units One and Two will assemble at Detroit Willow Run Airport, Ypsilanti, Michigan, at 2:00 p.m., and turn in Hertz automobiles to the Hertz agent at the airport. Rental charges for the two automobiles are to be central-billed to System Development Corporation.

Units One and Two will depart Detroit Willow Run Airport at 3:00 p.m. on UNITED AIRLINES FLIGHT 423, arriving at Chicago O'Hare Airport at 3:45 p.m., where they will be met by limousines from the HOWARD JOHNSON'S MOTOR LODGE, 8201 Higgins Road, Chicago 31, Illinois, where 15 double rooms with twin beds and 1 single room are reserved for the nights of May 13, 14, and 15.

A chartered Indian Trails bus will pick up the 19 people of Unit Three at the Battle Creek Holiday Inn at 1:30 p.m. and transport them to the Howard Johnson's Motor Lodge, 8201 Higgins Road, Chicago 31, Illinois, arriving on or before 5:00 p.m.

A conference room has been reserved at the Howard Johnson's Motor Lodge for the nights of May 13, 14, and 15.

Taxis may be utilized in Chicago for local transportation.

Saturday
May 16, 1964: The Howard Johnson's Motor Lodge will provide courtesy limousine service to Chicago O'Hare Airport and the group will depart O'Hare at 9:20 a.m. on TWA FLIGHT 29, arriving at Los Angeles International Airport at 11:00 a.m. Lunch will be served in flight.

The group will be met at Los Angeles Airport and transported by chartered bus to the BEL AIR SANDS HOTEL, 11461 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles 49, California.

Single rooms and double rooms with twin beds have been reserved at the Bel Air Sands Hotel for seminar members for the nights of May 16, 17, and 18.

Conference facilities will be provided at System Development Corporation Offices, 2500 Colorado Avenue, Santa Monica, California.

Transportation between the Bel Air Sands Hotel and the SDC Offices will be by buses chartered by SDC.

Tuesday
May 19, 1964: Please observe hotel check-out time.

Conferees will be transported to SDC Offices in the morning of the last day of the conference. Each will be issued individual airline tickets to his home city at the close of the conference. Chartered bus transportation from the SDC Offices to the Los Angeles International Airport will be provided by SDC.

## SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

### Itinerary of Southern Group of Traveling Seminar
Dr. C. Taylor Whittier, Tour Director

Monday
May 11, 1964: The group will assemble at 2:30 p.m. at the SARASOTA TERRACE HOTEL, Ringling and Washington Boulevards, Sarasota, Florida, where 15 double rooms with twin beds and 1 single room are reserved for the night of May 11.

A conference room has been reserved at the Sarasota Terrace Hotel for the afternoon and evening of May 11.

Taxis may be utilized for local transportation in Sarasota.

Tuesday
May 12, 1964: Please observe hotel check-out time.

Local transportation in Sarasota will be provided by a chartered Southern Tours, Inc. bus which will pick up the group at 7:30 a.m. at the Sarasota Terrace Hotel.

The bus charter will terminate at approximately 9:00 p.m. leaving the group at the Tampa Airport from where it will depart at 10:10 p.m. on NATIONAL AIRLINES FLIGHT 374 arriving in MELBOURNE at 10:40 p.m.

The group will be met at MELBOURNE Airport by courtesy limousine from HOLIDAY INN, 2605 North Dixie Highway, Melbourne, Florida, where 15 double rooms with twin beds and 1 single room are reserved for the night of May 12.

Wednesday
May 13, 1964: Please observe hotel check-out time.

Taxis may be utilized for local transportation in Melbourne.

The Holiday Inn will provide courtesy limousine service to the Melbourne Airport for the group to depart at 9:05 p.m. on NATIONAL AIRLINES FLIGHT 30 arriving at Miami Airport at 9:40 p.m.

The group will be met at Miami Airport by limousines arranged for by the GOVERNOR'S CLUB HOTEL, 236 Southeast 1st Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, where 15 double rooms with twin beds and 1 single room are reserved for the nights of May 13, 14, and 15.

A conference room has been reserved at the Governor's Club Hotel for the late afternoon and evening of May 14.

Local transportation in Fort Lauderdale will be provided by Broward County Schools.

Saturday
May 16, 1964: The group will be transported to the Miami Airport by limousines arranged for by the Governor's Club Hotel in time to depart at 8:35 a.m. on NATIONAL AIRLINES FLIGHT 33 arriving in Los Angeles at 12:10 p.m. Lunch will be served in flight.

The group will be met at Los Angeles Airport and transported by chartered bus to the BEL AIR SANDS HOTEL, 11461 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles 49, California.

Single rooms and double rooms with twin beds have been reserved at the Bel Air Sands Hotel for seminar members for the nights of May 16, 17, and 18.

Conference facilities will be provided at System Development Corporation Offices, 2500 Colorado Avenue, Santa Monica, California.

Transportation between the Bel Air Sands Hotel and the SDC Offices will be by buses chartered by SDC.

Tuesday
May 19, 1964: Please observe hotel check-out time.

Conferees will be transported to SDC Offices on the morning of the last day of the conference. Each will be issued individual airline tickets to his home city at the close of the conference. Chartered bus transportation from the SDC Offices to the Los Angeles International Airport will be provided by SDC.

## SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

### Itinerary of Eastern Group of Traveling Seminar
Dr. Richard Dershimer, Tour Director

| | |
|---|---|
| Monday<br>May 11, 1964: | The group will assemble at 12 noon at the ISLAND INN, Old Country Road, Westbury, Long Island, New York, where 15 double rooms with twin beds and 1 single room are reserved for the nights of May 11, 12, and 13. Travelers arriving at either La Guardia or Kennedy (Idlewild) International Airport may take cabs to the Inn or arrange with the Inn (516 - PI 1-4500) for limousine pickup at a cost of around $5.00 per person.<br>A conference room has been reserved at the Island Inn for the early afternoon of May 11 and after dinner on the nights of May 12 and 13.<br>Taxis may be utilized for local transportation. |
| Thursday<br>May 14, 1964: | The Island Inn will arrange for limousine service to John F. Kennedy International Airport and the group will depart at 9:30 a.m. on AMERICAN AIRLINES FLIGHT 230 arriving at Boston Logan Airport at 10:44 a.m.<br>A chartered Gray Lines bus will meet the group at Boston and transport it to the CHARTER HOUSE HOTEL, 160 Boyleston Street, Newton, Massachusetts, where 15 double rooms with twin beds and 1 single room are reserved for the nights of May 14 and 15.<br>Taxis may be utilized in Newton for local transportation. |
| Saturday<br>May 16, 1964: | A chartered Gray Lines bus will pick up the group at the Charter House Hotel at 9:00 a.m. May 16 and transport it to Boston Logan Airport to depart at 10:15 a.m. on AMERICAN AIRLINES FLIGHT 11 arriving in Los Angeles at 12:57 p.m. Lunch will be served in flight.<br>The group will be met at Los Angeles Airport and transported by chartered bus to the BEL AIR SANDS HOTEL, 11461 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles 49, California.<br>Single and double rooms with twin beds have been reserved at the Bel Air Sands Hotel for 135 people for the nights of May 16, 17, and 18. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Saturday May 16, 1964: (con't) | Conference facilities will be provided at System Development Corporation Offices, 2500 Colorado Avenue, Santa Monica, California.<br>Transportation between the Bel Air Sands Hotel and SDC Offices will be by buses chartered by SDC. |
| Tuesday May 19, 1964: | Please observe hotel check-out time.<br>All seminar members will be transported to SDC Offices for the last day of the conference. Individual airline tickets will be issued each seminar member at the close of the conference. Chartered bus transportation for the SDC Offices to the Los Angeles International Airport will be provided by SDC. |

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

# APPENDIX C

# DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

System Development Corporation: Traveling Seminar & Implementation Conference Project

Bureau of Budget #516407
Date of Expiration: 6/30/64

NAME OF SCHOOL DISTRICT ______________________________

NAME OF INDIVIDUAL COMPLETING REPORT ______________________________

POSITION OF INDIVIDUAL ______________________________

### FORM A

### SCHOOL SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE INNOVATIONS

(1964 - 1965)

I. Summary of Innovations

In this section we wish to learn the extent of the district's (high schools only) involvement in educational innovations. Innovations is broadly defined as any educational practice not in general use throughout the U.S.A.

For each innovation listed below, place a check in the appropriate column.

| | 1<br>In Use<br>(includes limited programs-pilot, etc.) | 2<br>Definitely Planned for Future | 3<br>Interested but No Plans | 4<br>No Present Interest | 5<br>Have Used but Discontinued | 6<br>Have Decided Not to Introduce |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Teaching machines or programmed instruction | | | | | | |
| b. Television instruction | | | | | | |
| c. Language laboratory | | | | | | |
| d. Team teaching | | | | | | |

FORM A (continued)

| | 1<br>In Use<br>(includes limited programs-pilot, etc.) | 2<br>Definitely Planned for Future | 3<br>Interested but No Plans | 4<br>No Present Interest | 5<br>Have Used but Discontinued | 6<br>Have Decided Not to Introduce |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| e. Ungraded program (subjects are not divided into semesters and students progress on individual basis) | | | | | | |
| f. Flexible scheduling | | | | | | |
| g. Use of electronic data processing (i.e., computer and electronic accounting machines) for:<br>1) Class scheduling<br>2) Attendance accounting<br>3) Grade reports<br>4) Test scoring and analysis | | | | | | |
| h. College-credit courses (students can earn college credit while in high school) | | | | | | |

FORM A (continued)

| | 1<br>In Use<br>(includes limited programs--pilot, etc.) | 2<br>Definitely Planned for Future | 3<br>Interested but No Plans | 4<br>No Present Interest | 5<br>Have Used but Discontinued | 6<br>Have Decided Not to Introduce |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| i. Foreign language courses emphasizing audio-lingual (listening and speaking) skills | | | | | | |
| j. School Math Study Group (SMSG) materials | | | | | | |
| k. Illinois Math Project (UICSM) materials | | | | | | |
| l. Physical Science Study Committee (PSSC) materials | | | | | | |
| m. Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (BSCS) materials | | | | | | |
| n. Chemical Bond Approach (CBA) materials | | | | | | |

FORM A (continued)

| | 1<br>In Use<br>(includes limited programs-pilot, etc.) | 2<br>Definitely Planned for Future | 3<br>Interested but No Plans | 4<br>No Present Interest | 5<br>Have Used but Discontinued | 6<br>Have Decided Not to Introduce |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| o. Greater Cleveland Math Project (GCMP) materials | | | | | | |
| p. Others (list below any innovation not mentioned above in which the district is or has been interested. Include innovations related to in-service teacher training, instructional material centers, etc.) | | | | | | |

FORM A (continued)

II. Description of Innovation

In this section we wish to obtain further information about the innovations checked previously.

List below each innovation you are using or plan to use and describe the extent of this use at the present time or according to plan of this date, by filling in the columns which are appropriate to each innovation.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Name of Innovation | Approximate Date Initiated or Planned for Initiation | Number of High Schools Involved | Curriculum Subjects Involved | Approximate Number of Students Involved | Approximate Number of Teachers Involved |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

System Development Corporation: Traveling Seminar & Implementation Conference Project

NAME OF SCHOOL DISTRICT ______________________________

NAME OF INTERVIEWER ______________________________

DATE OF INTERVIEW ________________

FORM B

STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

(1964)

A. How long does superintendent expect to remain in district?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 0-1 | 1-4 | Over 4 years |

B. What is the board's attitude toward new ventures, experiments, and ideas? (Does it generally favor trying new things or maintaining status quo?)

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Always Neg. | Gen. Neg. | Laissez Faire | Gen. Positive | Always Positive |

C. What is superintendent's relationship to board in general? (Does he function relatively autonomously?)

1. Professional and curricular

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Board always directs the superintendent's activities | | | | Superintendent's recommendations always accepted |

2. Business finance

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Board always directs the superintendent's activities | | | | Superintendent's recommendations always accepted |

D. How much freedom does superintendent feel he has in initiating innovations? In initiating experimental or pilot programs?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Any change needs prior approval | | Limited programs without prior approval | | No prior approval needed for initiating innovations |

E. Does he view himself as the chief proponent of innovations or does he need to be pushed into innovations suggested by the public, the board, administrators, teachers, etc.?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Resists innovations but can sell them | | | | Assumes professional leadership in handling innovations |

FORM B (continued)

F. What difficulties does he see associated with each innovation in regard to:

Name of Innovation

1. Getting it accepted by the public?

   1 2 3 4 5

   No difficulty — Great difficulty ______ ______ ______ ______

2. Getting it accepted by the teachers?

   1 2 3 4 5

   No difficulty — Great difficulty ______ ______ ______ ______

3. Getting it accepted by the principals.

   1 2 3 4 5

   No difficulty — Great difficulty ______ ______ ______ ______

4. Getting it accepted by the board?

   1 2 3 4 5

   No difficulty — Great difficulty ______ ______ ______ ______

5. Getting it accepted by the student?

   1 2 3 4 5

   No difficulty — Great difficulty ______ ______ ______ ______

FORM B (continued)

G. What effect does he feel particular innovations have on the district?

**Name of Innovation**

1. On personnel?

1 2 3 4 5

No effect — Radical changes ______ ______ ______ ______

2. On the organization?

1 2 3 4 5

No effect — Radical changes ______ ______ ______ ______

3. On facilities?

1 2 3 4 5

No effect — Radical changes ______ ______ ______ ______

4. On financing?

1 2 3 4 5

No effect — Radical changes ______ ______ ______ ______

H. What does he feel his part has been in initiating previous innovations?

1 2 3 4 5

Removed and impartial — Complete involvement

FORM B (continued)

I. What influence does he ascribe to the following in regard to implementing each innovation?

| Name of Innovation<br>Source | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Board of Education | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| Public pressure | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| Other superintendents (in general) | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| Research reports | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| Neighboring district(s) | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| Universities | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| State Dept. of Education | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| Professional organizations | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| Availability of federal funds | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| Seeming demonstrations of innovations in action | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| Salespersons (manufacturers and publishers) | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| Other | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ |

J. Are there any community issues, such as a surging population, racial tension, local economic depression, etc., which are affecting the school system?

1. 1 Yes — 2 No ______________________ Name issue

2. (If "Yes")

1 Extreme effect — 2 — 3 — 4 — 5 Limited effect

## FORM B (continued)

K. To what extent does the superintendent see the community as supportive of the schools?

1. The community?

|  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Antagonistic |  |  |  | Completely supportive |

2. The Board of Education:

|  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Antagonistic |  |  |  | Completely supportive |

L. Does superintendent see himself as an education pioneer? Does he have or is he looking for a national reputation?

|  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Yes |  |  |  | No |

To what extent will be compromise his principles in order to achieve his goals?

|  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Moralist |  |  |  | Expediter |

|  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Personal professional growth |  |  |  | Getting on with the job |

stem Development Corporation: Traveling Seminar & Implementation Conference Project

INTERVIEWER ____________________

DATE ____________________

## FORM C
## FACTUAL DATA INTERVIEW
## (1965)

### NORMATIVE DATA

1. Name of school district ____________________
2. City and state ____________________
3. Name of superintendent ____________________
4. Name and position of informant ____________________

### SIZE OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICT

1. Is this district a county district ________
   city district ________
   merged district ________
2. Is this a high school district ________
   unified district ________
   other (specify) ________
3. What is the population served by the high schools (nearest thousand)? ________
4. What is the area covered by the high schools (sq. miles)? ________
5. How many high schools are there in the district? ________
6. How many students are served by the high schools? ________
7. How many teachers are there in the high schools? ________
8. How many other certified professional personnel in the high schools? ________

FORM C (continued)

## C. FINANCES

1. How much money is allocated for teacher salaries? ______________

2. How much money is allocated for certified professional personnel? ______________

3. What is the total school budget this year (nearest thousand)? ______________

4. How much federal money is included in the budget (nearest thousand)? ______________

5. How much federal money has been obtained this year for particular educational innovations (i.e., language laboratories, etc.)? ______________

## D. SOCIAL-CULTURAL MILIEU

1. Is there a predominant ethnic background in the district?

   Yes ______________

   No ______________

   Specify ______________

   Percentage ______________

2. Is there a predominant religious group in the district?

   Yes ______________

   No ______________

   Percentage of:

   Protestant ______________

   Catholic ______________

   Jewish ______________

   Interdeterminant ______________

3. What is the classification of the district?

   metropolitan ______________

   urban-suburban ______________

   rural ______________

4. What is the predominant social class?

   upper middle ______________

   middle ______________

   lower middle ______________

FORM C (continued)

5. What is the mobility of population served by the district as measured by percentage of high school student turnover last year?

E. PERSONNEL POLICIES

1. What was the percentage of turnover in certified personnel last year?

Teachers

Administrators

2. Categorize the percentage of teachers by sex.

Male

Female

3. Categorize the percentage of teachers by age.

Under 30 years

31-50 years

Over 50 years

4. Categorize the percentage of the teachers by experience.

3 or less years

4-10 years

More than 10 years

5. Categorize the percentage of teachers by education.

No college degree

Batchelors degree

Masters degree or equivalent

Doctors degree or equivalent

6. Categorize the percentage of teachers by training.

At teachers college

At state college

At university

7. What is the starting salary of a teacher with only a Batchelors degree?

FORM C (continued)

8. What is the highest possible salary fo a high school teacher? ____________________

9. How many years has the superintendent been in the district? ____________________

10. How many years has the superintendent been a superintendent? ____________________

11. What is the educational level of the superintendent (highest degree held)?

F. EDUCATIONAL CRITERIA

1. What percentage of students starting high school, graduate? ____________________

2. What percentage of graduates go directly to an academic college or university? ____________________

3. How far (miles) is it to the nearest college or university which affords help and consultantships to the district? ____________________

4. What percentage of secondary school students in your district attend non-public schools? ____________________

5. To what extent are services available to your school district from the State Department of Education?

______ a. easily obtained whenever needed

______ b. requires moderate effort to obtain help from State Department of Education

______ c. not readily accessible

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

# APPENDIX D

## FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES: EXAMPLES

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

## OHIO TRAVELING SEMINAR

## TRAVELING SEMINAR PRE-REGISTRATION

## FOURTH ANNUAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GUIDANCE CONFERENCE

November 19, 1964

From 10:00 a.m. until 2:00 p.m., there will be twelve Traveling Seminars available for a limited number of conference participants. Pre-registration for these seminars is necessary. It will be possible for seminar participants to purchase lunch in the schools.

Please indicate your preference for one of the first three Traveling Seminars and/or your first, second, and third choice for one of the remaining seminars.

___ T.S. (10-11:30) no lunch
1. Mr. Jim Frost, Elementary Counselor, Monterey Elementary; a visit to an elementary guidance center and a chance to chat with a practicing elementary counselor.

___ T.S. (10-11:30) no lunch
2. Mr. Jack Frost, Elementary Counselor, West Franklin Elementary; a visit to an elementary guidance center and a chance to chat with a practicing elementary counselor.

___ T.S. (10-11:30) no lunch
3. Mr. Fred Wallbrown, Elementary Counselor, Finland Elementary; a visit to an elementary guidance center and a chance to chat with a practicing elementary counselor.

___ T.S. (11:30-2) lunch
4. Mrs. Elizabeth Noblitt, Speech and Hearing Therapist, Fearis-Lincoln Elementary; a visit to a speech and hearing therapy center, a demonstration of speech therapy and a chance to chat with the therapist.

___ T.S. (11:30-2) lunch
5. Mrs. Ann Reynolds, Teacher of emotionally disturbed children, and Mrs. Marie Henry, School Psychologist: a discussion of teaching techniques and materials and a chance to chat with the teacher and the psychologist. (This seminar is limited to 10 persons.)

___ T.S. (11:30-2) lunch
6. Mr. Alfred Kahler, School Counselor, Pleasant View Junior High School: a tour and a discussion of a new concept in junior high schools.

___ T.S. (11:30-2) lunch
7. Mrs. Le Moyne Brokaw, Principal, Monterey Elementary: a visit to a school with an on-going individual reading program and a chance to chat with the principal and one of the teachers.

___ T.S. (11:30-2) lunch
8. Mr. William Garrison, Principal, East Franklin Elementary: a visit to a representative elementary school library program and an opportunity to talk with the principal and the school librarian.

T.S. (11:30-2) lunch 9. Mrs. Helen Pendt, Reading Specialist, Monterey Elementary: a visit to an elementary school remedial reading center, a demonstration of remedial reading and a chance to talk with the reading specialist.

T.S. (11:30-2) lunch 10. Mr. William Zeitler, Principal, J. C. Sommer Elementary: a visit with a school principal who has responsibility for the administrative and curriculum aspects of an elementary guidance program in his building--special emphasis will be placed on viewing a school-wide guidance oriented curriculum unit in action.

T.S. (11:30-2) 11. Mrs. Charlotte Holston, Teacher, J. C. Sommer Elementary: a visit to a primary level slow-reading class and a chance to chat with the teacher.

T.S. (11:30-2) lunch 12. Miss Fay Alban, Teacher, Monterey Elementary: a visit to an intermediate slow-learning class and a chance to chat with the teacher.

Your Name:____________________________

Address:______________________________

______________________________

Mail to: David K. Dawson, Director
Pupil Personnel Services
Southwestern City Schools
3708 South Broadway
Grove City, Ohio

Enclosure with September/October 1964 issue of "Ohio Guidance News & Views
Division of Guidance and Testing, State Department of Education
751 Northwest Boulevard, Columbus, Ohio 43212

## PRESS RELEASE: NEW YORK EDUCATION DEPARTMENT'S CENTER FOR INNOVATION IN EDUCATION

For Release: Morning Newspapers, Tuesday, July 7, 1964

From: The New York State Education Department, Albany
Walter B. King, Phone GR 4-3851

For further information, Norman D. Kurland, GR 4-3703

Albany, N.Y., July 6, 1964... Efforts toward the achievement of integrated, quality education throughout New York State have been given impetus by the creation of a new CENTER FOR INNOVATION IN EDUCATION in the State Education Department.

This action by the Department is a step toward the implementation of the recommendations of the report "Organizing New York State for Educational Change," prepared two years ago by Dr. Henry M. Brickell, a consultant on educational experimentation to the Commissioner of Education.

Dr. Norman D. Kurland has been named as Director of the Center and Dr. Lawrence C. Howard has been designated Associate Director. Both are presently with the Department.

The new unit, which will be attached to the Office of the Commissioner, will have as its continuing responsibility the direction and coordination of statewide efforts to raise the quality of education through the design, evaluation, and dissemination of new ideas and practices.

According to Dr. James E. Allen, State Commissioner of Education, the job of the Center for Innovation will be "to welcome fresh ideas, to encourage the trying out of new approaches in schools and colleges, to evaluate the results, and to pass these along to administrators and teachers throughout the State. We want to promote throughout the entire educational system of the State an attitude that favors and fosters research, experimentation, and innovation--not change for its own sake but change carefully calculated to improve the level of learning and to lift the status of teaching."

At Commissioner Allen's request, the Center will direct its first and immediate attention to integration as one of the major areas of innovation in today's education and will seek to determine how the resources of the State Education Department and of the State of New York in general can be more effectively mobilized for a concerted effort in this area.

Recognizing the promotion of integration within our schools and colleges not only as an obligation, but also as an opportunity to improve and encourage quality education. Dr. Allen stated that "The Center will explore ways and means of achieving integration in its broadest meaning--far beyond the mere assignment of students to schools and classrooms, to the development of the understanding and respect for each individual for the worth of every other individual."

The Commissioner stressed that the failure to improve the quality of education through the benefits of integration is a disadvantage not only for minority groups but for all children. "Integration is inseparably linked to better education for all," Dr. Allen emphasized.

In explaining recently the mission of the Center for Innovation to the staff of the State Education Department, Dr. Allen stated: "The Civil Rights movement has given us new insights into the meaning of the principle of equal educational opportunity for all and a new challenge to give practical effect to that principle. If the long march of lock-step inequality is to be broken and broken forever, we shall need both integration and a broad range of new, creative, quality educational programs available to all young people of this generation."

The Center expects to work closely with the universities and school systems in the development of imaginative new programs for better education. It will concern itself in particular with the dissemination of new ideas as their effectiveness is demonstrated.

For the past two years Dr. Kurland has directed the development of the department's College Proficiency Examination Program. He received his doctorate from the University of Michigan and taught history at Hobart and William Smith Colleges in Geneva and Hofstra University in Hempstead. From 1959-62 he was Associate Director of the Inter-University Committee on the superior Student at Boulder, Colorado.

Dr. Howard joined the department in January to work on the Proficiency Examination Program. He spent the previous two years on the staff of the Peace Corps in the Phillipines. He has taught Political Science at Brandeis University and Hofstra University. His doctorate was earned at Harvard University.

TAYLORVILLE COMMUNITY UNIT SCHOOLS

Taylorville, Illinois

October 12, 1964

## A PROPOSED TRAVELING SEMINAR

Attached are materials covering a proposed Traveling Seminar to improve instruction and curriculum in the Taylorville Schools. It is proposed to accomplish this by two avenues--in-service training for participating staff members and indirectly the total staff by "feedback"; and the improvement and evaluation of the Taylorville curriculum through visiting "school systems where outstanding examples of the use of new media and instructional methodology can be examined."

The project (Traveling Seminar) has been evaluated and approved by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the supervisors from the University of Illinois. Each has encouraged the project and has asked for an evaluation and summary.

The project would be financed by funds allocated by Senate Bill #749.

It is proposed to visit Evanston Township High School, Elk Grove Elementary Schools, West Leyden High School, Urbana Community Unit Schools, Champaign Community Unit Schools, and the Decatur Public Schools.

The Superintendent recommends approval of a Traveling Seminar to be conducted November 1-7, 1964.

The Superintendent further recommends that a member of the public relations committee of the Board of Education join the study group for the week.

# TAYLORVILLE COMMUNITY UNIT SCHOOLS

Taylorville, Illinois

## TRAVELING SEMINAR

Purposes and specific objectives for traveling seminar:

1. To provide an opportunity for seminar members to "visit school districts where outstanding examples of the use of new media and institutional methodology can be examined."

General Purposes:

1. Provide an opportunity to observe innovational practices which are actually being employed in schools similar to the Taylorville school system.

2. Stimulate discussion, evaluation and consideration of the observed situations.

3. Provide an opportunity to discuss with the practitioners; that is, teachers, supervisors and administrators the strengths and weaknesses, benefits and problems of specific innovations.

4. Lay the ground work for subsequent introduction of new media and instructional methodology and other programs in the Taylorville schools.

5. Define problems and obstacles in regard to the introduction and use of educational innovations and new media.

6. To provide an opportunity to the teachers (elementary and secondary), consultants and administrators from the Taylorville school system to view the same situations; thereby providing a concentration of effort for encouraging the implementation of innovations.

7. Evaluate the touring seminar as a means of:

   a. learning about and stimulating interest in innovation

   b. gathering data relative to the change process

   c. testing the "Field Service" concept in education

   d. identifying the reasons for acceptance or rejection of an innovation

## TAYLORVILLE COMMUNITY UNIT SCHOOLS

Taylorville, Illinois

## TRAVELING SEMINAR

## RESPONSIBILITIES OF PARTICIPANTS

Each participant of the Traveling Seminar is charged with a responsibility, both as an individual and as a member of the group, for assisting in fulfilling the purposes and the plan of the Seminar. Among other things, this responsibility includes the following:

1. To identify problems and obstacles in regard to the introduction and use of educational innovations and new media--in Taylorville.

2. To identify significant factors or characteristics that tend to promote or to provide the opportunity for the development and use of educational innovations and new media--in general; in Taylorville.

3. To identify significant aspects of methodology, or of the process which contributes to the development and use of educational innovations, which tend to promote a change.

4. To identify and describe those characteristics of leadership which appear to be significantly essential for the successful development and use of innovation and new media.

5. To describe and assess the resources which contribute to the implementation of the educational innovation.

6. To assist in the formulation of specific recommendation for a systematic approach to educational innovation in the Taylorville system.

7. To assist in the collection and analysis of descriptive data about:

    a. school systems that innovate

    b. the change process

    c. leaders that innovate

8. To evaluate the Traveling Seminar as a tool for disseminating information and for stimulating plans for implementation on the part of Taylorville members of the Seminar.

9. To make recommendations for improving and refining the technique utilized in this project.

10. To identify and describe some of the essential characteristics and/or working relationships by and between our elementary, junior high, and high school teachers, consultants, administration, Board of Education and the community in order to further the establishing of a climate in which significant educational innovations and new media can be encouraged and promoted, and in order to work cooperatively as a team to reduce the gap between the development of a significant innovation and its more general implementation in the Taylorville Unit.

11. To make recommendations for other studies as an outgrowth of this Seminar.

3

# TAYLORVILLE COMMUNITY UNIT SCHOOLS

Taylorville, Illinois

## TRAVELING SEMINAR

## GENERAL FORMAT

1. An evening orientation session, in which the staff of the school(s) to be visited "orientate" the seminar members to the innovations of the school and provide related information.
2. Visitation to the school site(s), observe, interview teachers, pupils, community representation and administrations as is appropriate.
3. Concluding session with the staff of the school being visited to clarify any points from the orientation session and the visitation period.
4. Exchange of opinion and observations by the members of the seminar.
5. Presentation of tour findings and recommendations to the Taylorville School staff and the community.
6. Share in the total evaluation of the seminar effort.

TAYLORVILLE COMMUNITY UNIT SCHOOLS

Taylorville, Illinois

TRAVELING SEMINAR

Orientation Meeting

Memo
Memorial Lunchroom

Number One
4:30 p.m.

October 20, 1964

I. Next Meeting - October 27, 1964 - 4:00 p.m.

II. Challenge
   A. Innovation - define - 10/27
   B. Keep both feet on the ground concerning our responsibilities
   C. Feedback a must--
      1. Assuming continued tenure
      2. Willing to "travel extra mile"
      3. Innovators

III. Orientation
   A. Why SDC - August, 1964, issue?
   B. Items to be considered today and 10/27
   C. Purpose of the Taylorville Seminar
   D. Format
   E. Responsibilities of participants
   F. Schools to be visited
   G. Tour agenda

IV. Preparations Prior to November 1st
   A. Vote!
   B. --The Shape of Education for 1964-1965
   C. Lesson Plans
      1. Units - tests
      2. Substitutes
   D. One case please
   E. Miscellaneous
      1. Brief case
      2. Cameras - 3 - Polaroids
      3. Recorder
      4. Cars

V. Outcome
   A. Depends--
   B. Evaluation

- C. Recommendations
- D. Reports
  - 1. Tentative Report
    - a. Nov. 9th - 4:00 p.m. - Combined Steering Committee and Administrative Council
      - 7:30 p.m. - Board of Education
    - b. Nov. 12th - 4:00 p.m. - Progress report by Report Committee to Seminar
    - c. Nov. 17th - 12:30 a.m. - PTA Council - Center
    - d. Nov. 19th - 10:15 a.m. - Research Dept. - OSPI - Springfield
    - e. Nov. 30th - 4:00 p.m. - Final report by Committee to Seminar

## TAYLORVILLE COMMUNITY UNIT SCHOOLS

Taylorville, Illinois

## TRAVELING SEMINAR

### Orientation Meeting

Monday October 26 — Number Two 4:00 p.m. — Memorial Lunchroom

I. Mechanics
- A. Reporting Groups
- B. Car Assignments
- C. Roster

II. Questions
- A. Purpose
- B. Format
- C. Responsibilities of participants
- D. Tour Agenda - Time at Champaign and Urbana?
- E. What should we put in our final letter to our hosts?
- F. What should be considered in our "summary" meeting--Monday at 7:30 p.m.

III. Preparations
- A. See Orientation Number 1

IV. What does the Taylorville staff want us to search out?
- A. How may we determine their desires?
- B. Can we agree on a few items of importance for all to study?
  - 1. Some of immediate value
  - 2. Other requiring time for study and planning

V. Follow-up "Readiness"
- A. Our success will depend on our follow-up activities
- B. Friday - p.m. - Write individual summaries or critiques of strengths and weaknesses--implications for T'ville of observed innovations for use Saturday a.m. The critiques will be handed in to the "Report Committee"
- C. What should our final report cover or contain?
- D. How can we use William Rogge?

VI. Evaluations and Suggestions
- A. Excerpts from letters received

VII. Miscellaneous